THE
NEW YORK REVIEW

VOL. II SEPT.-OCT., 1906 NO. 2

PERSIAN MYSTICS. I. HOW THEY ROSE *

William Barry, D. D.

From an historical point of view the mystic is definable as one that has, or professes to have, a direct experience of Divine things. In his own language, *patitur Deum*. Knowledge comes to him in this region as by contact, sense, or feeling. It is given through forms, indeed, but these correspond to the media whereby physical substances make their presence clear to us in touch and sight. A widely quoted dictum of Pascal's would serve by way of text to all the books on mysticism ever written; "the heart," says that deep thinker, "has its reasons, which reason knows not of. We feel it in a thousand things. It is the heart that apprehends God, and not the reason. Behold what is meant by perfect faith, God felt in the heart."[1]

This negative rule, passing by, or not appealing to abstract logic, determines the nature and method of a discipline which, even where as in St. John of the Cross it employs Aristotelian terms and branches out into distinctions, remains very much more of an art than a science. Accurately speaking, the mystic teaches how to live, not how to analyze or explain life. His philosophy aims at practice. His rules are a road-book, *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum*, as the medieval guide (not, it would appear, St. Buonaventura,) named it; or in the better known translation, a *Pilgrim's Progress*. The intellect, again, though discursive, deals with its objects as fixed or static, and its natural affinities are with space. But the heart while, in attachment stable, cannot rest until it arrive at perfect union with that which it loves.

* L. I. Pizzi, *Storia della Poesia Persiana*, two vols. Turin, 1894.

[1] Pascal, *Pensées*, 189, édition of Jouaust, 1874, cf. 36, "Faith Without Reasoning."

Therefore, its law is dynamic and its movement is onward, "the devotion to something afar from the sphere of our sorrow." These primary differences between two aspects of our one human nature have given rise to a logic that abstracts from love, and to a love that often triumphs over logic. We need not, for the present, undertake to go beyond them. Our dialectician shall contemplate formal causes; our mystic tends toward the Final Cause.

Glancing into a distance which lies in the East, and where people, customs, language, literature, demand an interpreter at every step, our readers may ask, "which is the nearest way to all that?" Well, we reply, let us open our Plato. In the loveliest of Greek prose writers we distinguish both elements as described above,—the static and the dynamic, the discursive and the unitive. Socrates comes before us as a logician and a lover. He is each by turns, according to his mood. Nay, that is not altogether true. In argument the sage analyzes with deadly effect, until he drives common opinion back to its last refuge and extorts from the average man. ("mostly a fool,") the confession that he is ignorant. But when theory is required from the Master, what does he do? He takes refuge himself in myth.[2] Either he knows nothing or he is inspired. For Socrates the guide of life is revelation or tradition. Though his demon never gives a positive sign, yet in the conversations which Plato records of his wonderful personality, we listen over and over again to a doctrine of choice in action, of progress towards the highest, of communion with God, which implies and shapes a real experience. If the Ideas, or essences of things, reveal themselves by degrees, in life also as it moves up to fruition there is a *Scala Amoris*. The Platonic system thus becomes a Song of Ascents. It preaches the philosophy of Divine Friendship. It lends itself to the Pythagorean forms of initiation, discipleship, mysteries, stages, and growing enlightenment. At its centre is the Grand Arcanum. If it begins with a question, "*Que sais-je?*" it ends in the most sublime of affirmations, "*Dieu sensible au cœur.*" And it has a method. Socrates lives like an ascetic. He is poor, he goes barefoot, he gives up the world's prizes, he cultivates detachment, he takes no thought for the morrow, he falls into ecstasy, he dies a martyr. So little does he believe in mere speculation that he writes nothing. He is not a sophist; but, were he bred and born at Shiraz near the Persian Gulf, all men would have called him a Sufi.

[2]Conclusion of *Gorgias*; myths in *Phædrus, Symposium, Republic; Phædo*.

This parallel none will deem extravagant who have pondered both its terms. What we have just laid down comes out beyond peradventure on a study of the *Meno*, *Symposium*, *Apology*, *Phædo*, *Republic*, and *Phædrus*, following the order of development which is shown not to be unlikely by recent enquirers.[3] The soul emancipating itself from sense, discovers that it has an intuition of eternal realities, which is a reminiscence due to former states of being. It yearns after perfection and sees it to be attainable only by union with Ideas, that is to say, with one unchanging truth, ever drawing the seeker onward as its different facets melt and combine into the Highest Good. And Good is more than Being, as the philosopher comprehends these "transcendental notes.[4] That which attracts, which is loved, excels knowledge, cannot be grasped by formal science, is ineffable and altogether One. It is the scope of all intellectual achievement. In the contemplation of beauty absolute, beholding it with his mind's eye, "man will be able, by bringing forth and nourishing true virtue, to become the friend of God and be immortal, if mortal man may." But he must rise from stage to stage, from things visible to the invisible, until at last another vision is vouchsafed to him of a single science which is the science of beauty everywhere." These, concludes Diotima, the teacher of Socrates, are the stepping-stones from earth to heaven. The highest philosophy is an art to love.[5]

No more can now be said touching an illustration which, though taken from Athens in the year 400 B. C., may well do duty as an overture to these brief notes on Persian mystics during the Middle Ages. For it has been seriously maintained that the Sufi, no less than the Cynic, Stoic, and Academician, comes down from Socrates. On what line of descent? On two lines, it is answered, both Neo-Platonist, one at Alexandria, the other, chiefly Syrian, in Asia. To fix our thoughts, we will mention the last really considerable authors who, undoubtedly deriving from the genuine Greek schools, represent and may have corrupted Plato's mysticism. There is Plotinus, who has left us the *Enneades* (205-270, A. D.); and, again, there is Dionysius, the false Areopagite, whose works, *De Cœlesti Hierarchia*, *De Divinis Nominibus*, *De Mystica Theologia*, (about 520 A. D.), so pro-

[3]Lutoslawski, *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, 207, 255. 239, 246-250, 287, 295, 330, 337, London, 1981.

[4]*Republic*, vi, 509, "For the Good is not essence, but far exceeds essence in dignity and power."

[5]*Symposium*, 211, 212. And see in *Phædrus*, 245, 250, the sections which begin, "The soul through all her being is immortal."

foundly influenced the school-treatises of the thirteenth century. Dionysius, according to the view, now prevalent, was a Monophysite. Plotinus had never been a Catholic; but Ammonius Saccas, the guide whom he closely followed, and who began teaching in the age of Severus (200 A. D.), was born of Christian parents, educated in the catechetical school of Alexandria, and secretly or openly fell away.[6] We can hardly doubt that Neo-Platonism, as put forward by Ammonius, took a certain coloring from the neighborhood of Christian ideas. His disciple, Plotinus, lectured in Rome. A suggestive comparison, as regards language or method, might be instituted between this elegant though concise writer and St. Thomas Aquinas.[7] Both make use of a style which is highly technical, yet clear and unaffected. Both argue their questions point by point as in a never-ending disputation. And both, while, employing the syllogism, announce a loftier way of wisdom, leading on to the intellectual vision in which they declare felicity consists. Rarely do we observe a shade of passion in either. The Neo-Platonist elements re-appear, two hundred and fifty years after Plotinus, in the False Areopagite, and have left their mark on the *Summa*. It would be an excellent piece of criticism to trace them out, to describe how St. Thomas incorporates them with his Aristotelian philosophy, and to consider their bearing on problems, now somewhat fiercely debated, which regard our knowledge of the Divine Nature and its attributes. That investigation, however, is foreign to our present enterprise, But we should never allow ourselves to forget that the Angelic Doctor was a mystic, as well as a logician in the chair.

In 529 Justinian suppressed the schools of Athens. This took place forty-four years after the death of Proclus, whose *Institutio Theologica*, deeply tinged with esoteric or magical ideas, may still be read. Seven of the deprived philosophers fled to Ctesiphon where the Persian King, Chosroes, held his court. Their stay was of no long duration. It would be rash to suppose that in a few weeks or even months Isidore and the six companions planted the seeds of a doctrine which did not flourish until Persia had lost its independence in a series of battles between 633 and 642. The Mohammedan conquest, so far as we can tell, found no system among these descendants of Zoroaster in any way resembling the Sufi creed. Yet the ideas proper to Hellenism had been scattered from the Euphrates to the

[6]Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vi, 19, denies this.

[7]Plotini, *Enneades*, Paris, Firmin Didot, 1855.

Indus, ever since Alexander's triumphant march. Nearly a thousand years were now gone by. The new-birth of Persian religion which we term Mazdaism happened under the native dynasty of the Sassanides which began with Ardashir in 212 A. D., and expired with Yasdegard III in 651. During this long period some interchange of thought between East and West will surely have not been wanting. The Eclectic school, founded in Egypt, and amalgamating Greek notions with Oriental in which mysteries and theurgy played their part, soon had its adherents in Syria. Emperors like Elagabalus and Alexander Severus; queens like Zenobia; philosophers and critics, no less eminent than Longinus; sophists, courtiers, magicians, to which class we may assign Porphyry, Iamblichus and Libanius; all belong to this Asiatic world. They were adepts in a discipline curiously anticipating much that we find later in the Sufi poets and novice-masters. Then, too, we cannot quite overlook the Nestorians, who spread far and wide, even into China, and though strongly opposed to the contemplative, ascetic, and celibate genius of their enemies, the Monophysites, issued from a Greek centre at Antioch, and must have propagated their doctrine by the aid of Greek symbols. Confused and motley as all these influences appear to us, they were certainly real. The barrier of Language, indeed, was formidable. And, in the absence of direct proof, we are thrown upon conjecture. But if such exchange of ideas went on between Persians and Greeks, the dragoman, it is pretty clear, would be mostly a Syrian. (Gibbon, vi, 45-51, on the Nestorians in Persia, etc., Smith's Edition.)

Did Mohammed acquire what knowledge he has exhibited of Christian teaching from the same sources? That has been frequently alleged. But the reference on which its patrons rely (K. xv, 105), is interpreted now of Salman, the Persian. E. H. Palmer observes, "The oral Jewish and Christian traditions incorporated in the Qur'an were, no doubt, current among the Jewish and Christian tribes,"—various of whom had settled in Arabia.[8] "The churches of Yemen and the princes of Hira and Gassan, were instructed," says Gibbon, "by the Jacobite and Nestorian bishops."[9] We may take it that the "Apostle" could not read and had never even seen the Greek Scriptures. In any case, whatever the Sufi system owed to Alexandria, from Mecca, it derived none of its elements; and it is more than doubtful if the husband of Kadijah would have recognized in its reveries or its

[8]Palmer, *The Qur'an*, I, xlvii, Oxford, 1880.
[9]vi, 215.

Monism the doctrine which he came to announce. Though a visionary, Mohammed was not a deeply spiritual man. Nor was he an ascetic. "There are no monks in Islam," he told his followers.[10] The teachers who sat in his chair by and by were canonists, the *'Ulema*, not metaphysicians, mystics, or saints. He made no provision for celibacy, obedience, or even poverty, though he said, "In poverty is my glory." None, either, did he make for definite religious training; and none for the director of conscience (*murshid*), without whom Sufi discipline is not to be imagined. Not sarcerdotal nor monastic, the Islam of Arab invention constantly tempts us to illustrate its temper and its doctrine from Calvin's *Institutes.*

Among the "religious Books of the East," it would be difficult to point out one which is so utterly bare of mystic veils, so hard and practical, so seldom touched with dreaminess or meditative light, as this disordered set of *Readings*[11] which from beyond the Ganges to the golden Tagus for centuries occupied the devotional hours of the Mussulman in his Mosque. When the Sufi made his ground sure,—it was not until after a long struggle—inside the orthodox pale, he smote on this dead rock with his staff of allegory and brought forth streams in abundance. We shall give instances hereafter of such perverted ingenuity from the great Master, Jelal-al-Rumi, and other reconcilers. Left to his unaided sense, the student of Mohammed's homilies will admit in them a powerful, often a sublime rhetoric; but the spiritual yearning, the detachment from life, the colloquy between bride and Bridegroom, the passing away of "I and Me" into "Thou art myself" and "The All is the One,"—of such things he will come upon no vestige. They were as unknown to the Badawin of the Desert as were the metaphysics which rent Christendom asunder. We can affirm it the more confidently because in anthologies like the *Hamasa* and the *Kitab al Aghani* we still have preserved to us the genuine Arab culture, picturesque and erotic enough, but never yielding us the strain that sounds from end to end of the Persian Sufi poems. On that ancient background we view the "Prophet" where he contends, not with singers and rhymers, but with his fellow patricians, classmen, keepers of the Ka'aba, for a supremacy which was outward and political, not less than religious. We may describe Mohammed as a lawgiver by no means contemptible, shrewd, humorous, determined, and finally triumphant. For the secrets of the hidden

[10]Implied in K. v, 89.

[11]Koran=Heb., *Keri*, to be read.

life, his disciples have ever betaken themselves to oracles not flourishing in the Hijaz.[12]

However, the apologists look around for points of contact between the Sufis and the Mediator whom, in every mystic rhapsody, it is incumbent to praise; his retreat during the forty days of Ramadan to the cavern at Hira; his raptures, tremblings, visions, intercourse with angels, journey on the "night of power" to Jerusalem and Paradise; on his miracles, simplicity of living, fixed hours of devotion; and they quote many a traditional sentence (*hadith*) from which deep lessons may be drawn. In 623, they say, one year after the Hijra, "forty-five men of Mecca joined themselves to as many others of Medina, took an oath of fidelity to the Prophet, and formed a brotherhood," of which the purpose was "to establish community of good and to perform daily certain religious practices by way of penitence." Abubakr, the first Lieutenant of the Apostle, and Ali (who died in 661), we are told, created "assemblies" in which vows were taken and these exercises gone through. In 657 Uvais-i-Karani set up the first religious order; it is described as exceedingly austere. If so, it must have been opposed to the plain teaching of Mohammed, who cried out, "O ye that believe, forbid not the good things which God has made lawful to you." He did, it is true, prohibit "wine, and games of chance, and statues, and divining arrows;" but these were "abominations of Satan's work." (K. "Chapter of the Table," *ut supra*). Nowhere does he lay down principles from which monastic institutions could be derived. And it is not until 780 A. D. that we hear of the term Sufi, or of the first mohammedan convert (*takya*) which is attributed to a Syrian, Abu Hashim.[13]

When the Arabs conquered Persia, they were as rude and unpolished as the wild Northern tribes that carved the Roman Empire into Kingdoms. They possessed neither science nor philosophy. Their religion began with a war cry, "No God but Allah, and Mohammed His Apostle!" Its recurring formula, "In the name of God the merciful, the compassionate," was moulded on a zoroastrian phrase, *Benam i Yesdan i ba'hsayisgar dadar*, "In the name of God, the merciful, the just." Its conception of the unseen world, included many things derived by ways not easily traceable from the old Magian creed,—the dualism of Creator and creation, the Almighty and Satan, the bridge of judgment (*al sirat*), the resurrection, Paradise and Hell,

[12]See Nöldeke and Guyar, "Mohammedanism," *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xvi.
[13]W. H. Clarke, *Awarifu-l-Ma'arif*, i. e. *Guide of Adepts*, Eng. trans. p. 1.

angels and demons. These elementary beliefs, as we may call them, are found throughout a vast expanse of Asia, and furnish resemblances between the Iranian, Israelitish, Christian, and Mohammedan forms of faith. Hence the submission of Persians to Islam can be well understood, although a remnant of the Fire-worshippers would never quit their peculiar customs and were driven into India, where their descendants survive as the Parsees of Bombay.[14] To the multitude one prophet was as good as another. Mohammed took the place of Zarathustra. Yet, in no long time, the native spirit asserted itself. A great schism divided the South of Islam from the North. The Apostle's son-in-law, 'Ali, became a holy mystic personage, with almost divine attributes, eclipsing by the splendor and pathos of his story the seer of Medina, whose only legitimate Vicar he was acknowledged to have been. The martyrdom of 'Ali's two sons, Hasan and Husain, gave the Persians their miracle-play and their Passion-tide,—that singular episode of Kerbeta (Oct. 9, 680), which is yearly celebrated with tears, during the first ten days of Moharram. Hasan had to wife "the fair Shahrbanu," daughter of Yasdegerd, who was the last of the Sassanide Kings. Thus from 680 A. D. Islam was for ever rent in twain by the Shiah schism. But, if the immediate occasion of that revolt must be sought in 'Ali's misfortunes and his children's tragedy, it is well said that we find its true source in the gulf which separates the Aryan and Semitic races. In the eyes of Saracens at Mecca and even at Baghdad, the Persians were Protestants who rejected tradition (the *Sumnat*), would not own the Caliph, and never had the faith. Arabs, Turks, and Mongols united in the original church of Islam, stand on the one side, while the men of Farsistan pass by on the other. Certain holy names they revere in common, and to all alike the Koran is inspired Scripture. But even in his pilgrim's garb the Persian runs a risk of maltreatment before the Ka'aba. And the allegories which his poets love are as truly foreign to the men of the Desert, as the tales with which his storytellers have charmed all peoples lie beyond the powers and dazzle the imagination of the Badawin who listen to them.[15]

Much unfounded and pernicious talk is circulated in our literature touching Arabian science, metaphysics, and intellectual capacity,

[14]Pizzi, i, 27, after Malcolm and Darmesteter.

[15]L. Pelly, *The Miracle Play of Hasan and Husian*, London, 1879; R. F. Burton, *To Al-Madineh and Meccah*, London, 1898; W. Muir, *The Caliphate*, 244-324, London, 1892.

often to the disparagement of medieval Christians.[16] It is impossible to quote a genuine Desert race which ever displayed any turn for abstract thinking; and the science, chiefly medical, which Southern Moslems boasted, was a knowledge of empirics. The misunderstanding has come about naturally, though not altogether excusably, from a supposition that whatever was written in Arabic owed its origin to the Arabs. As well might we argue that all the philosophical or scientific works composed in Latin down to our day were due to the Romans. Like the language of Cicero and Tacitus, which followed the course of Empire in the West, so did Arabic prevail as the sacred and literary tongue wherever Islam was accepted. But each of the convert nations impressed on that dialect its own seal. The proud barbarian of Yemen could not assimilate a learning which he despised, or enter into systems of ideas created by a patient logic and requiring the mind to attenuate its sensuous symbols into the ether of speculation. It was only at the court of Damascus or in the royal schools of Baghdad, far away from Araby the Blest, that Greek thought, strangely transfigured, won its votaries and excited the liveliest discussions. Even the heroical Persian stories had not found favor in the eyes of Mohammed or of his Sunnite Lieutenant, 'Omar. Idle then it is, and utterly misleading, when the romance of the Persians, or their characteristic religious ideas, are assumed to be in truth products of the eloquent but merely practical genius that speaks in every chapter of the Koran. Whatever traces of Hellenic influence we light upon in our Sufis, they must have been derived through Syrian channels; and the whole of that interesting medieval culture now termed Arabic, should be known as Iranian, Moorish in the sense of Berber-Spanish, or an offshoot of the Lower Greek.

As for Islam, it is a law and a ritual, not a metaphysics. "We should occupy our thoughts about the grace of God, and not about the nature of God," is among the Prophet's traditionary sayings. But when this meagre doctrine was brought into the neighborhood of a Platonism, however debased, some refinement or reconciliation became inevitable. The Persian was developing a new language out of his old Pahlair. Free thought took a wide range, and with it entered a system of toleration perilous to orthodoxy, under the Abbassides, from 750 A. D. onwards. Manichæan or Gnostic dreams had never, perhaps, died away among Iranian thinkers. There was

[16]Notable instances in S. P. Scott, *The Moorish Empire in Europe*, Philadelphia, 1904.

a consanguinity of ideas which bound all these philosophies together; a real though long-drawn pedigree would show us their sources in the Dualism of the Zend religion; and students well-qualified to judge, (for instance, the late H. E. Palmer), carry the line backward still into Brahmanic India, to the Vedas which amid multitudinous forces or deities recognize a fundamental unity. But we need not pursue this investigation so far.[17] It is more to the purpose that under Mansur (754-776) and his successors, especially Ma'mur, (814-833), translations from the Greek were multiplied; while repeated and daring assaults upon the literal significance of the Koran showed how the Persian spirit strove to reconcile its instinctive philosophy with its imported revelation. In such a soil the mystic lore of the Sufi was prosperously planted.

At first the Shi'ites, (as their name denotes), were "sectarians," who declared 'Ali and his descendants to be the genuine Caliphs. A convert Jew, 'Abdallah ben Saba, had even proclaimed that 'Ali was an incarnation of God,—which doctrine its hearers deemed blasphemy at the beginning; but in no long time it found acceptance far and wide. The twelve Imams who continued that succession, were worshipped as divine emanations. The Koran was to be interpreted allegorically. And the Supreme God was unknowable and unapproachable to human reason. How, then, could union with him be effected? Only by the heart, in ecstatic mood, through symbols which had a mere instrumental function, by acts of love and self-surrender. This doctrine reaches its consummation in the sect of Ismailians, otherwise known as the Assassins. Its chief exponent, 'Abdallah ben Maimuh, was a Persian, born in Susiana (850 A. D. or earlier), who sketched the system and founded a secret Masonic rite for his adepts. To confuse with such political adventurers the harmless id'e Sufi would be quite unjust. But in this heated atmosphere he grew up and flourished like the green bay tree.

It was, we are told, a certain woman, Rabi'a, who might be compared in the external features of her life with St. Teresa, that, dying in 752, A. D., had first preached a doctrine of Pure Love in Islam. Her grave is at Jerusalem. Among her visitors, perhaps her disciples, were Hasan of Bassora and Shakik of Bokhara. We have already mentioned Abu Hashim (757) and his monastery. Another college is attributed to Abu Said about the same time. Its members gave

[17]H. E. Palmer on Sufism; Renan, *Averroes*, 90-116; and see Max Müller, *The Vedanta Philosophy*, London, 1891.

themselves up to prayer and meditation, engaged in mystic exercises, and put on the *Khirka*,—a woolen garment from which they took the name of Sufis, (*suf.* in Arabic, meaning wool or hair cloth). In its original form, this retirement from the world and dedication of oneself to regular observances, might seem not incompatible with Mohammed's teaching, though certainly unlike his own practice and theory. But a refuge was opened to speculative minds, to the melancholy, the devout, the dreamers, and the hypocrites, who in their several ways could not discover what they most desired in formal orthodox, i. e., strictly Arab customs, or in the letter of the Koran. Under Muktadir (908-932) the Persian Hallaj taught publicly that every human being was God. For this announcement of blasphemy he was tortured and put to death. Sufis had allegorized, by necessity of thought, from the beginning. They were now shaping an esoteric doctrine with corresponding symbols, which could never be so persuasively rendered as in verse. Religion became poetry to them, and poetry furnished a veil, a medium, an inspiration, beyond the attacks of the 'ulemâ, or at least not to be done away whether by argument or brute force. The whole of Persian literature was impregnated with secret fire, spiritual, intangible, as of a mystic sun, hidden behind clouds of imagery drawn from life and landscape, from virtue and vice, from love, marriage, friendship, from travel and rest, from earth and heaven. If Jelal-uddin Rumi, as critics affirm, is the greatest poet ever produced by Pantheism, he yet arose in a world where its votaries might be reckoned with round him, and its rhyming prophets never failed. Of these extraordinary phenomena the most remarkable undoubtedly is that resemblance which we observe between the Persian monastic discipline and the Christian, both outward and inward. We cannot pretend to resolve all the questions which that likeness raises. But in a day of rapidly growing tendencies towards Monism, we shall not be losing time if we dwell upon them.[18]

WILLIAM BARRY.

[18]It need scarcely be said that whatever the title of prophet, apostle, and the like, are given in these pages to Mohammed, they are quotations and nothing more.

DR. MALLOCK'S ESSAY IN RECONSTRUCTION*

James J. Fox, D. D.

He could raise scruples dark and nice,
And after solve 'em in a trice;
* * * * * *
Only to show with how small pain
The sores of faith are cured again.

Butler's *Hudibras.*

The brilliant author of this curious book informs us that the religious thinkers who have endeavored to defend religious truths from the negative conclusions of science have miserably failed; and that the purpose of this volume is to suggest a more excellent way. Adding the weight of his authority to that of numberless thinkers, the writer observes that to live a healthy, vigorous, civilized life, a man must have in his mind some belief with regard to the meaning of existence. At the present day, he continues, the life-belief hitherto dominant and accepted as axiomatic is vanishing. The only remedy for this disaster is to find a new basis for the ancient belief. All over the world men have been attempting this task. They have had very little success. Mr. Mallock comes to the rescue of humanity. He disclaims the intention of bringing Christianity within the scope of his treatment, that is, Christianity considered as a supernatural religion. Only the three fundamental truths of natural religion are to benefit by his labors:—the existence of God, free-will and immortality. These three beliefs, he warns us, are threatened with extinction by the advance of science: "With the extraordinary advance in our knowledge of the sensible universe which has taken place during the last hundred years, they not only seem to have been deprived of all the positive evidences in their favor, but have also been confronted with a new conception of existence which seems to have rendered them in their very nature incredible."

The defenders of religion,—theologians, the clergy, clerical apologists—have stupidly blundered in attempting to find a flaw in the adamantine chain of scientific seasoning. "The clerical way is to

* *The Reconstruction of Religious Belief.* W. H. Mallock. New York, Harpers.

scrutinize science in detail, with a view to showing that the process which science represents as automatic would break down at this point or at that if it were not for the helps and interference of a living power external to it." The philosophers have been equally short sighted, for they have endeavored to reduce science to insignificance by reducing the sensible world to a dream of immortal mind. Mr. Mallock gives us to understand that his method will be radically different. He will concede all that science claims; he will honor the three grand negations and then he will demonstrate how an acceptance of the atheistic *Nay* may be rendered compatible with a belief in the religious *Yea.*

This announcement is of a nature to make lethargy itself sit up and listen with keen expectation. The problem of reconciling science and religion has been discussed for the last forty years, with incessant industry and zeal from every point of view, under every available light, old and new, by innumerable minds, many of which are of respectable calibre though covered by a shovel-hat. So one experiences a thrill of surprise that not one of them has found the true solution; that the correct line of thought, which has, like an intellectual northwest passage, eluded all explorers, is now to be revealed by Mr. Mallock. We have long been among the assiduous readers and sincere admirers of that able and entertaining publicist. Who can read him without enjoying his strong vigorous style, bounding along like a fresh mountain stream, bubbling with wit and flashing out humor at every rock that it meets? Who has failed to appreciate his keen nose for a fallacy, his unerring eye for the weak joint in an opponent's armor, the artistic skill with which he manages his sharp dialectic rapier; above all, the knack, all his own, of putting his adversary out of the fight by capping his argument with some burlesque parallel? But the possession of these powers along with some contempt for and a trifling knowledge of metaphysics, never gave a hint that he was the mighty original thinker capable of producing a work which if it should fulfil its promise would deserve to take rank at once among the immortals. So when we find him coming forward to introduce a Napoleonic revolution in apologetic strategy, we are inclined to be somewhat skeptical; we feel that, better than ever before, we can realize what were the emotions of the Frenchmen who first heard the country girl declare that she was going to raise the seige of Orleans and crown the king. However, we recall Goliath of Gath and David and the fighting men of Israel; after all, Joan did beat the English;

and most of the world's progress is due to the rejection of traditional ways of thought and action in favor of short cuts discovered by genius that has flashed from unexpected quarters. So, certain to be entertained, and prepared to be enlightened, we fix ourselves comfortably in an easy chair to give Mr. Mallock a hearing as he first describes the critical position of the City of God, beleagured by the relentless army of scientists, and then unfolds his plan for raising the siege.

Mr. Mallock's first care is to point out with considerable enjoyment the lamentable failure of clerical apologists, who have, he tells us, merely attacked particular conclusions of science. As we listen to him we have no alternative to concluding that these folk have behaved with no more reason than is exhibited by a blue-bottle fly persistently banging its head against a window pane in its endeavor to get out of a room, while just alongside there is a wide open door at its service. The proper plan, Mr. Mallock teaches, is to "adopt the explanation of science precisely as science gives it to us." In support of his assertion that clerical apologists of theism have been utterly ousted by science, Mr. Mallock recites the failure of theologians and clerics to make good their defence of Mosaic cosmogony, geology, and theology against the scientist—a subject which gives him a legitimate opportunity for indulging in a liberal flow of scarcasm.

But we read the passage over again to make sure that we have not missed his line of thought. For, as he told us, the present topic is the bearing of science on natural religion. Surely so acute a thinker is not confusing two entirely different questions, namely, the effect that the advance of knowledge has had upon certain long-maintained theological opinions based upon the too literal interpretation of the Bible, and the effect of the same knowledge on the truths of natural religion, or theism. Yet this is just what Mr. Mallock is doing in his anxiety to discredit the theistic apologetics which his method is to supersede. In the fortunes of these exegetical theories the truths of theism are not involved at all. However, we are chiefly interested in Mr. Mallock's scheme as a whole. Let us assume that the clericals all are, "thrust like foolish prophets forth; and their words to scorn are scattered." Nor need we dwell on the subsequent arraignment of the philosophers by Mr. Mallock, further than to remark that many persons belonging to the schools of realism or idealists who hold to free will may challenge Mr. Mallock's right to so far contract the comprehension of the term philosophy as to confine it to a certain school of idealism.

The first step in the new plan of reconstruction is "to adopt the explanation of science precisely as science gives it." What, then, is the explanation of the universe which we are invited to adopt, and incorporate in the intellectual fabric of our religious faith? Mr. Mallock enuntiates it at the close of the section in which he declares science to have taken philosophy prisoner, and bound the captive to its triumphal car; science harmonizes the contradictions of philosophy, places them in their proper order, subjects them to its own original system; "and exhibits man with greater completeness than ever as the helpless and vanishing puppet of a process which for him means nothing." Again, we are told that the *scientific* presentment of things "gives us, from first to last a system of pure determinism." And after justly observing that "whether we are the puppets of outside matter or the puppets of outside spirit, our position is from the religious point of view just as hopeless in the latter case as in the former," he declares that "to reduce us to puppets of some sort or other, by linking our whole lives to a general process of the universe is a necessary outcome of the whole scientific scheme." And remember, we must accept this explanation just as science gives it.

By the time one has reached this point one is seriously perplexed and asking incredulously "what in the world does Mr. Mallock mean by 'science'? Can it be possible that he thinks so meanly of his auditors, and has so far forgotten sundry passages in *Is Life Worth Living* and elsewhere in which he himself has scored persons who mistake philosophic speculation for science, as to here parade the extravagances of Hæckel and his followers under the name of science? Yet this is just what Mr. Mallock, without blinking an eye and with his serious countenance is attempting to do. He gravely declares that by "science" is meant "the system which professes to explain all existences as modes of a single substance, which, in itself unknown to us, is by our own experience apprehended under the guise of matter —just as the movements of the hand, itself invisible, might be known and studied by us if it wore a visible glove." And "the conclusion which we are assuming ourselves to have reached"—which we are to take as "science" offers it—"is that if we take science and man in the sense (just) indicated, science deduces man from the general substance of the universe and exhibits him to us as one of its passing phenomena, in a way so complete as to provoke no further inquiry." We were prepared to find that Mr. Mallock would get into some tight places, and to extricate himself would perform some fine logical acro-

batics, in his endeavor to lay out a new road to theism—but we did not expect that he would resort to the triviality of putting forth the vaporings of Hæckel as the consensus of science. Three decades ago Mr. Mallock wrote: "Few spectacles indeed in the whole history of thought are more ludicrous than that of the modern positivistic school with their great doctrine of verification. They apply it rigorously to one set of facts, and then utterly fail to see that it is equally applicable to all." Now Mr. Mallock provides one spectacle more ludicrous, when he gravely introduces as "science" Professor Hæckel with his theory of life constructed precisely by rigorously applying the doctrine of verification to one set of facts and deliberately ignoring another set of at least equal importance to the issue. One really can scarcely believe that Mr. Mallock is serious, and that this elaborate thesis is not a mere piece of make-believe, when he says that science verifies as its last conclusion that all phenomena are so many modes of a single undivided substance which are all alike transient and all equally necessary. One might expect some person of no mental training, and no acquaintance with philosophic thought; who uncritically accepts any printed page purporting to be scientific, at its face value, speaking in this strain after reading his six-penny edition of the *Riddle of the Universe*. But Mr. Mallock! We turn over the pages of his earlier work and stop at the chapter devoted to the exposure of the flaws abounding in "the logic of scientific negation." In those days our author termed the anti-theistic party "Positivism." Just now he calls it "science," and he informs us that the explanation of science, which must be accepted as science offers it, carries with it irresistible arguments against the existence of freedom, as well as of God and immortality. Then he contended that science was absolutely incompetent to give any opinion whatever on the subject.

> "My only purpose," he wrote, "to show is that if man has any moral being at all he has it in virtue of his immaterial will—a force, a something of which science can give no account whatever, and which it has no shadow of authority either for affirming or denying; and further that if we are not prevented by it from affirming his immaterial will, we are not prevented from affirming his immortality and the existence of God likewise."

In one of the many passages in which he ridicules clerical methods the author accuses the clergy of resorting to what he calls a piece of "theological card-sharping." Like the conjurer who distracts the attention of the spectators while, at a critical stage of some trick, he substitutes one card for another, "in the same way," says Mr. Mal-

lock, "the practitioners of the method now referred to, engage to defend or demonstrate certain religious doctrines, for which, in the course of the argument, they substitute something else, and persuade themselves and others that the substitute is the genuine article." And with his ineffable contempt for the methods of the theological card-sharpers, to make good his assertion that the scientific explanation of the universe is incompatible with elemental religious truth, Mr. Mallock unblushingly substitutes Hæckel for science. But the parallel between his own procedure and that which he imputes to the theologians, does not, we are convinced, hold further. For we cannot believe he really endeavors to convince himself here that the substitute is the genuine article. Listening to him stating the case against religion, one recalls a scholastic disputation of the class-room. The assailant of some orthodox doctrine attacks it boldly, puts forth his arguments with seeming sincerity, presses them home, with many a *distinguo* and *sub-distinguo*, in short, appears to be in deadly earnest as he blesses some damnèd error with scriptural text and powerful ratiocination. Yet all the while the audience knows that he is but playing a game of make-believe, which will terminate by exhibiting the impregnable strength of the orthodox doctrines. Everybody knows that Mr. Mallock knows how unfounded are the pretensions of Hæckelian monism to masquerade as the established authoritative teaching of science. He knows that for one scientist—if there is even one—who would acknowledge monistic speculation as science, or the legitimate offspring of science, there are a hundred who fully concur in the judgment of the scientist who recently tore Hæckel's pretensions to pieces.

> "It is sufficient," writes Sir Oliver Lodge," to meet him on scientific grounds, and to show that in his effort to simplify and unify, he has underestimated certain classes of facts, and has stretched scientific theory into the region of guess-work and hypothesis where it loses touch with science altogether. The facts which he chooses gratuitously to deny, and the facts which he chooses vigorously to emphasize are arbitrarily selected by him according as they will, or will not fit into his philosophical scheme."

Precisely the charge which, more than thirty years ago, Mr. Mallock made against the methods which he here affects to accept with a deferential bow as science. During the interval that has elapsed between the appearance of *Is Life Worth Living* and the issue of the *Reconstruction of Religious Belief*, has positivism acquired a surer footing in the intellectual world? Has it succeeded in establishing its anti-theistic doctrines? Is Hæckel able to announce the complete success of the positivist host that entered the field under

the leadership of Huxley and Spencer? One would think so judging from the present attitude of Mr. Mallock. But anybody acquainted with the trend of contemporary thought in the field of science and religion is aware that the scientist already quoted has expressed the current estimate of Professor Hæckel in the following terms:

"He is, as it were, a surviving voice from the middle of the nineteenth century; he represents in clear and eloquent fashion, opinions which were prevalent among many leaders of thought—opinions which they themselves in many cases, and their successors still more, lived to outgrow; so that by this time Professor Hæckel's voice is as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, not as the pioneer or vanguard of an advancing army, but as the despairing shout of a standard bearer, still bold and unflinching but abandoned by the retreating ranks of his comrades as they march to new orders in a fresh and more idealistic direction."

In his estimate of the result of "the extraordinary advance in our knowledge of the sensible universe" on religious belief to-day, Mr. Mallock obviously confuses consciously or unconsciously, two distinct issues, as we have already seen him do regarding the history of the conflict between scientists and theologians. While the trend of scientific thought in the past twenty years has shown a marked reversion to theism, it has, indeed, more and more propagated and strengthened a disinclination to belief in revelation and the supernatural. Had it been Mr. Mallock's purpose to deal with "Christianity as a religion of miracle" instead of with natural theism, his picture of the inroads made upon belief by scientific habits of thought might be defended with ease. As the case stands, his description of the situation is quite incorrect.

Before passing from that part of his volume devoted to exhibiting "the strength of the negative arguments" it must be observed, in justice to Mr. Mallock, that in some places, he writes as if he asks that the conclusions of monism be accepted only provisionally, for argument's sake, as a step towards the deployment of his new method of defense. Three or four phrases might be quoted in support of this plea. But as we have already seen, the entire gist of his argument is incompatible with this position. He assiduously strives to create the impression that the negations of "science" are solidly based. With the instinct of the artist he gives the key-note to his performance by the introduction of a large part of a rather dythirambic poem published in one of his previous works, whose burden is the pitiless destruction of religious belief by scientific truth, a being with hands

of stone and wings of steel who addresses the philosophers in words such as these:

> Across the paths where I must go
> The shuttles of the lightning fly
> From pole to pole, and strike nor know
> If Christs or kingdoms live or die.
>
> How wilt thou bear the creeds that bleat
> Like starving sheep from frozen downs—
> The eyes that trust the blinding sleet,
> The anthems that the thunder drowns?
>
> Till maimed and wingless burnt and blind,
> I am made one with God and feel
> The tumult of the mindless mind
> Torn on its own eternal wheel.

The introduction of inconsistencies, however, may be a clever device to gradually bring the reader to a proper frame of mind for the reception of Mr. Mallock's gospel. The essential feature of his proposed method of reconstruction, the secret of reconciliation between atheism and theism lies in the proposal to ignore the principle of contradiction, so that a man may adhere to the "scientific" explanation of the universe, which denies the fundamental religious truths,—a personal God, free will and immortality, and yet, because there are also practical reasons for believing, believe them. Unless Mr. Mallock means that the negations are valid, there is no room for proposing this solution of the quarrel. So, in the first act of this dialectic drama as the curtain falls, "science" is in the act of strangling faith.

In the next act Mr. Mallock prepares to rescue the victim. The action takes on a tinge of the humor which often arises in comedy from the contrast existing between the words of some speakers and actions simultaneously taking place. We have been told in the first place, that we must take the scientific explanation exactly as science presents it, and in the second, that this irresistible explanation exhibits man as a mere puppet of the universe, in a way so complete as to provoke no further enquiry—and Mr. Mallock in almost the same breath, proceeds to show that the scientific" explanation" is so wofully incomplete as inevitably to provoke further enquiry, and that this enquiry leads to conclusions diametrically opposed to the explanation that is to be respectfully adopted without question or cavil.

The constructive portion of his work is not new in substance, but there is some novelty introduced into the proportions of the various parts to each other and to the whole. The argument is that the three

great theistic truths have their justification in the needs of practical life—that life in these forms which civilized men value would fail to flourish, and even cease to exist, without them. Turning over an old note book we came across a citation from Taine's early correspondence which contains in a nutshell the argument here eloquently expanded into many pages. "If you would know the Beautiful, the Good, the True; if you would prove that there is a law of conduct for man, an immutable goal for the artist, an absolute certainty for the scientist, you will be obliged to examine into the nature of God, and to believe in him." This argument for religion is an old commonplace of the clerical text-book, though it formerly did not receive the attention it deserves. That Mr. Mallock should set forth any proprietary claim to it is to be explained, perhaps, by the theory that his acquaintance with clerical apologetics is not so Catholic as his denunciations of that form of literature would lead one to believe. It is true that he has introduced a non-essential novelty into his construction. Instead of taking his stand on the deeper and more important elements of character and conduct involving morals and spiritual ideals, he, with the purpose of appealing to a larger audience, confines himself to the "interests, principles, affections and esthetic enjoyments, which are commonly supposed to be the rivals rather than the dependents of religion, but are generally recognized constituents of avdanced culture and refinement." And a very compact bridge to theism Mr. Mallock builds out of his materials. Its grace and lightness may perhaps attract some epicurean suffering from a sense of the emptiness of life, to try it in the hope of finding it lead to a religious corrective for the *vanitas vanitatum* of existence. The bridge is similar in design to that of the clerical apologists. They, however, prefer to employ for their structure the solider stuff that is drawn from the mines and quarries of man's moral and spiritual nature; they build with steel and stone, while Mr. Mallock choses to show his skill in lath and stucco.

Now having from the facts of human life—facts as real and of at least as much dignity and significance as those which the senses report to us from the realm of matter and motion—proven the affirmation of religion, one might say to Mr. Mallock: "You have given ample demonstration that this "scientific" explanation is one-sided, imperfect, and consequently, if offered as a complete account of the universe, erroneous, why trouble our heads any more about it? Why not, concurring with the verdct of Sir Oliver Lodge, say, 'The scheme

formulated by Professor Hæckel must to philosophers appear rudimentary and antiquated, while to men of science it appears gratuitous, hypothetical, in some places erroneous and altogether unconvincing'"? "Not at all," protests Mr. Mallock, "science remains exactly where it was, we cannot call its conclusions in question without calling in question all definite knowledge likewise, and if we can only qualify the definite negations of science by putting against them the affirmations implicit in civilization we are still confronted by the old intellectual deadlock." Truly, as old Sir Toby says, this is excellent fooling. Let the play proceed.

The next development consists in setting forth in about sixty pages of close, conclusive reasoning the well known argument proving the existence of purpose and pre-arrangement in the universe. This portion of the book deserves to be in better company. Reading it one recalls the clerical joke about the young curate who was breakfasting with his bishop: "I am afraid, Mr. Jones, you have got a bad egg," said his Lordship. "Oh! Not at all," replied the prudent Mr. Jones, "parts of it, I can assure your Lordship, are excellent." And now Mr. Mallock sums up his argument in the conclusion that:

> "The very science which, as expounded by Spencer and Professor Hæckel, has oppressed religious thought from the days of Darwin onward, which is denounced by its enemies as the grossest form of materialism, which is in reality the strictest form of determinism, and for all practical purposes is the completest form of atheism, is found to hatch itself, under the incubation of its own principles, into the re-affirmation of a Power to which, since it feels and purposes, no other name is applicable than that of a living Deity."

Surely the voice of the oracle is growing ambiguous. Science, that is Hæckel, proves that there is no God, and that man is but a puppet of determinism; and "we cannot call its conclusions in question without calling in question all definite knowledge likewise." Now, Hæckel, under the guidance of Mr. Mallock, reasoning on precisely the same grounds on which he based his atheistic negation, is made to declare for the existence of God. And in this extraordinary essay in religious construction we are asked to accept the latter conclusion without any disparagement to the former. Here one of his audience might respectfully address Mr. Mallock: "You have shown, as you yourself say, 'that even the materialism of the crudest kind, which begins with the atheism of an ignorant and blaspheming boy is bound by the mere process of reasoning on its own principles to end in the recognition of a purposive God of some sort.' Why, then, all this

talk about irreconcileable antagonisms, and intellectual deadlocks, and accepting the "scientific" explanation with its negation of God and free will, just as it stands?" "Pardon me," replies Mr. Mallock, "your remarks indicate that you are afflicted with a disease peculiar to the clerical mentality. You jump at conclusions. You fail to remember that we are still confronted with the problems of good and evil, of fate and free will." And Mr. Mallock in pursuance of his theme that the extraordinary advance in our knowledge of the sensible universe which has taken place in the last hundred years has deprived religious truth of all credibility, summons from the dust of the ages, Job and St. Augustine to testify as corroborative witnesses of Haeckel, in the case of science versus religion. Through many pages Mr. Mallock discusses the great enigma. He puts forth the ancient objections in modern phrase which adds not one iota to their terrific force. He shows, as hundreds of theologians and philosophers have shown before him, that, while no complete speculative, or logical, solution may be given of the puzzle, the argument which reason draws from man's practical life, compel us to believe in a benevolent God, and in free will. But he takes care to sustain the impression that the contradictory thesis is established in possession; and, at last he flashes on his mystified audience his luminous *irenicon*. It consists, simply, in disregarding the ground of reason and thought, the principle of contradiction. To nerve his followers to this act of intellectual suicide, he offers the authority of Mansel and Spencer, but he spares us the quibbles of the old Greek Sophists and the puzzle of Achilles and the tortoise which anticipated the work of the Dean and the author of the Synthetic Philosophy on this topic.

There is but one objection to this plan of Mr. Mallock. When anybody attempts to put it in practice, with a clear perception of its implications, reason becomes a kaleidoscope in which truth and falsehood shift, change places, and whirl around till they dissolve into a common darkness. Consecutive reasoning is impossible; thought becomes a nightmare; the interchange of speech between human beings as meaningless as a dialogue between a monkey and a parrot, and the volume before us, as well as every other record of the intellect, a tale told by an idiot ,signifying nothing. Were it the aim of this versatile author to attack instead of to stand sponsor for this proposal, one can easily fancy how completely he would bring it under an avalanche of ridicule and sarcasm! Probably he would construct a dialogue between some champion of morality and a gay Lothario

desirous of eloping with his neighbor's wife. Morality would admit that though the exigencies of civilization demanded a belief in free will, and a moral Ruler of the universe, nevertheless the arguments against these beliefs were unanswerable. Lothario, coached by Mr. Mallock, would triumphantly prove that, as a creature of determinism, he could no more avoid carrying off Dulcinea than the moon could refuse to continue her monthly revolution.

This curious volume contains some parts which if published by themselves would have some merit as a popular presentation of theistic proof. And by the excision of some other portions with a readjustment of the point of view in the remainder the entire volume would be, not indeed a new, but a lively criticism of moribund Hæckelian monism. Had Mr. Mallock not been lured into strange entanglements by his ambition to show his superiority to mere clerics and philosophers he might have set forth the main contents of this book in a way to produce a very different effect. He would, in the first place, have disposed of the pretensions of Hæckel and his school; then he would have marshalled his arguments for belief in free will and a personal benevolent God. Taking up the difficulties that are involved in the existence of moral evil, he would have admitted their full force; but he would at the same time, have insisted upon the truth that a hundred difficulties do not make a doubt. In company with the author of *The Grammar of Assent* he would have pointed out how the limitations of our intellect, the inadequacy of abstract ideas to fully represent the realities of existence, result often in a logical crux which we are unable to solve, but which offers no ground for questioning the basic principle of reason. And if he had happened even to read old Nicholas De Cusa on the hidden synthesis of irreconcileables, he never would have been led into the mistake of complacently imagining that he could achieve the glory of inventing a new basis of theism by sacrificing the principle of contradiction. He deserves the thanks of all friends of religion for his essay in defence of the religious truth, even though his good intentions have produced only a volume which, taken as a whole, is but—

"Vacant chaff, well meant for grain."

JAMES J. FOX.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE:

III. ITS GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Francis E. Gigot, D. D.

The problems of the Higher Criticism of the Bible are the lawful subject-matter of scientific investigation. Questions relative to the authorship, date, literary form, integrity, etc., of the Sacred Writings may be reverently, yet scientifically, examined in the light of principles which will commend themselves to unbiased scholarship. Such is the general position of the students of the Higher Criticism of the Bible; and obviously, its correctness can hardly be questioned by any fair-minded man. The problems with which they deal bear on that human element which the inspired books have in common with the non-inspired writings of antiquity, and consequently, all that can reasonally be expected of the Higher Critics is that they treat all such problems in that scientific manner which excludes bias, while it applies to the subject in hand principles in manifest harmony with the fundamental laws of the human mind.

Foremost among those principles is the canon which bids us to look upon the various books of Holy Writ as bearing necessarily the impress of the circumstances in the midst of which they originated. The principle is the primary law of literary and historical criticism concerning the works which antiquity has handed down to us. And hence, the students of the Higher Criticism of the Bible claim, with evident justice, that in applying it to the sacred writings they employ no new or arbitrary canon that can be rightly objected to. As a rule, God so acts through His creatures as if He had apparently no share in their work. And in point of fact, He has so acted through the inspired writers as to leave upon the sacred books all the distinctive features of individual human authorship. "Though the Bible be inspired, it has all such characteristics as might attach to a book uninspired,—the characteristics of dialect and style, the distinct effects of times and places, youth and age, of moral and intellectual character."[1]

---

[1]Card. Newman, *Discussions and Arguments*, 2d edit., p. 146.

A second principle adopted by the Higher Critics of the Bible, and one which they consider as a natural consequence from the foregoing, is that the solution of the literary and historical problems connected with a sacred book should chiefly be obtained through a close study of its actual features. The author of the book was the child of his day, and he meant his work to be used first by his contemporaries. His ideas, fears and hopes, were practically those of his age and country, and countless references to past or present conditions, social, moral, political, religious, etc., of his own people or of surrounding nations, found a natural place under his pen. His style and vocabulary are plainly those of the literary kind he has adopted, and bear witness to the linguistic conditions of the time to which he belonged. Whence Higher Critics argue that one is only right in gathering all such data and in inferring from them with more or less moral certainty, what should be thought of the date, authorship, literary kind, manner of composition, integrity, etc., of a particular book. This has been, and is constantly, done with regard to the Higher Criticism of ancient works, secular and ecclesiastical, and is all the more imperatively to be done anent the sacred Writings,—specially those of the Old Testament,—because many, perhaps the bulk of them, are really anonymous, and also because traditions concerning them usually prove but little reliable.

A third principle also much in vogue among the Higher Critics of the Bible is more comprehensive than the two already mentioned, inasmuch as it refers to all the material at their disposal and to the manner in which it should be handled. It can be best formulated in these words which St. Paul wrote in another connection: πάντα δοκιμάζετε,τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε (I Thes. v, 21). In virtue of this principle, no bit of evidence, however small, should be neglected. Internal data, must of course, be made the most of, as required by the foregoing principle of Higher Criticism. But also external evidence should not be ruled out *a priori*. The problems agitated by the Higher Criticism of the Bible are so delicate and complex that every piece of information, whatever its origin, should be welcome. Higher Critics who wish to do thorough work will therefore avail themselves of the ancient traditions current within and without the chosen people of God; they will have recourse to the data supplied by the comparative study of the Semitic languages; peruse ancient MSS. and Versions of Holy Writ; take into account the researches and discoveries made in Bible Lands; consult the works of learned men of the past and of

the present, whether they advocate, or on the contrary, oppose critical solutions, etc., etc. All the materials thus gathered must be carefully tested: πάντα δοκιμάζετε. It will profit nothing simply to abide by ancient opinions, because they are old, or to trust implicity critical positions, because they are new. Everything that bears on the subject in hand, must pass through the crucible of the most severe examination, for only what can, and to the extent in which it can, stand this fiery test, deserves to be considered as of permanent value. The student of the Higher Criticism should not be too easily satisfied with more or less received views, ancient or modern, since a more common view may, after all, be a less probable one in matters of criticism as well as in other matters. His only concern must be to gather particles of truth wherever found: τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε. Whatever is proved solid and good in time-honored positions, he will hold as precious gold; and so will he do also with whatever amount of truth he perceives in modern views; for in either case, nothing short of anti-scientific prejudice would prompt him to act otherwise.

As just formulated and explained this third principle can be easily recognized as a judicious and truly scientific rule of criticism. The student who fully grasps it and steadily applies it, will gradually get rid of that credulity which is the natural characteristic of the child's frame of mind, and grow into the reflex and personal knowledge which becomes a man's riper years. Through the self-same principle he will also be freed from the blind obstinacy either in ultra-conservative and antiquated positions, or in hypercritical and more or less rationalistic novelties.

The last principle of the Higher Critics to which we desire to call attention, regards the *a posteriori* manner in which theories should be framed and tested. It is plain, they tell us, that views to which no reasonable basis can be assigned can lay no claim to scientific acceptance. To amount to any thing, theories, ancient and modern alike, must have been suggested by facts sufficiently ascertained and which have to be accounted for. They must have been framed in harmony with all the available data. They should be enlarged and modified in various ways when this is required by facts recently brought to light, and be discarded altogether when they cannot be stretched any longer to offer a sufficient explanation for all ascertained data. As no number of *a priori* conceptions, however acute or often repeated, no amount of vague conjecture and strong feeling in favor of an opinion, can secure for that opinion a real scientific standing, so, in like manner,

we are told, no number of preconceived notions, no amount of attachment to long-cherished solutions of Biblical problems, should betray us into a hasty, not to say capricious, rejection of a theory which may have been slowly elaborated by generations of experts in critical matters. Pure and simple appeals to the dictum of authority, to the positions of a school ancient or modern, to the views of a man however brilliant or generally well-informed, will not weigh much against scientific theories. As theories must rest on facts, so must they be disposed of by appeals to facts. Finally, it stands to reason that in Biblical, as well as in other, matters, theories really tested over and over again by all manners of independent minds have a right to be considered as established at least with regard to their main lines.

The foregoing is a brief exposition of the general principles of the Higher Criticism as understood and applied by scholars desirous to do scientific work on the problems of authorship, date, literary forms, integrity, etc., of the sacred writings. It shows that the leading assumptions of the Higher Critics, when divested of all anti-religious bias, are nothing else than the valid rules of literary and historical criticism, and consequently may lawfully be applied to the study of the various problems suggested by the scientific study of Holy Writ.

Francis E. Gigot.

THE NEW KNOWLEDGE AND THE OLD PHILOSOPHY

II. SPECIFIC DISTINCTION: VEGETABLES AND BRUTES.

Walter McDonald, D. D.

In an article[1] in a recent number of this REVIEW, I took up the the question of indifference of species in the ignoranic world with a view of presenting the main facts and explanations which are the outcome of modern scientific research and speculation, and which must be taken into account by all of us who adhere to the traditional positions in philosophy. It is with the same purpose of presenting the modern positions in order to indicate those which require special consideration that I discuss in the present article the question of specific distinction between the organic and the inorganic world.

Differences of opinion as to the nature of species becomes more marked as the species rise in the scale of being. Many philosophers who have no sympathy with the Scholastic doctrine of substantial forms as applied in inorganic chemistry, insist on it, more or less unknown to themselves, in biology and psychology. The phenomena presented by living organisms, they think, can be explained only on the hypothesis of a vital principle altogether different from matter with its qualities; and as any such principle must be substantial,—sustaining the peculiar phenomena which it manifests, not sustained in and by something more fundamental than itself,—it is plain that its presence in living things would imply substantial and not merely structural difference between them and inorganic matter of the highest kind.

This holds *a fortiori* of things endowed with what is now called mind—what the old writers would call perception and appetition. It is argued that these actions are something more than mechanical or chemical movements however modified; essentially different even from the vital acts of assimilation, growth, and reproduction that are seen in vegetables. The movement of falling water may, after passing through a number of machines, be so modified as to become light-

[1]NEW YORK REVIEW, Oct.-Nov., 1905.

vibrations; but how can we conceive its becoming a conscious perception or a feeling? The two orders differ *toto coelo*; which means that the actions which belong to them must come from different principles. This, in turn, implies that beings endowed with powers of perception are different not merely in structure, but in substance, from those which are not so highly endowed.

I. Mutual Concessions.

Whilst there can be no hope of reconciling opinions so diametrically opposed,—for if there is but one kind of substance there cannot be two or more, and *vice versa*,—one may notice a tendency in both parties to admit the force of some of the arguments of the other side.

Thus, whereas in old times almost all the actions of living beings were regarded as vital, and therefore as emanating from a principle different from inorganic matter, however modified in structure; it is now admitted by many vitalists that the muscular contractions which take place, say, in speaking or walking, are not so different from the mechanical or chemical movements of matter as to imply a substantially different principle. Vitality has been pushed back and limited so as to cover but a comparatively small number of actions,—those whereby the energies received from inorganic matter, by way of food or stimulation, are modified in direction or in quality. It is held that in addition to the energies which plants and animals receive from without, there are others of a directive or qualitative order, native to the organism, so to speak, and not modifications of mechanical or chemical forces; and it is for these comparatively few energies and actions and their principle that the vital character is claimed by some of the foremost vitalists of recent times.

Monists, in turn, have shown a tendency to recede from the the position they held when they were known as Materialists,—that living and inorganic matter are of themselves equally inert, and that plants and animals move and act only as they are moved and acted on from without, like any other machine. Many writers of this school now admit that living organisms are self-moving,—which was the old Scholastic contention; they deny, however, that this proves substantial difference between inorganic matter and living things. Radium and other bodies they regard as self-moving, and they conclude that the faculty is common to all forms of matter, which they represent as having been alive and even conscious before

it got the most rudimentary form of cellular structure. Some years ago Monistic writers were wont to insist that all matter was equally inert and dead,—as far as the power of self-movement is a test of life; now we are assured that, to judge by the same test, all matter is equally alive.

The average man of sense, I fancy, will sympathize very little with this development of the Monistic theory. Every one knows, of course, that the molecules not merely of gases but of liquids and solids are active; it has to be proved, however, that they are not withal of their nature inert,—that their actions do not come to them entirely from without. Radium, it is true, has shown what at first seemed like spontaneous generation of energy; but on closer investigation the energy evolved was seen to result from what may be called ultra-chemical decomposition, and to be produced in the same way, substantially, as heat is produced in the combustion of coal. This, however difficult to explain, no one thinks of regarding as spontaneous in the sense in which the Schoolmen regarded vital actions as arising spontaneously from a principle of life. Still less, I feel assured, are men of sense likely to believe that either consciousness or sub-consciousness attends the explosions that take place in the sun, the movements of the planets, or the more homely operations of watches, steam-engines, and similar machines. Inorganic matter may wear a double face in the dim light of metaphysics; the chemist, however, the physicist, the astronomer, the man of the world, handles it and sees it as it is,—moving blindly, unconsciously, and as it is moved,—and does not trouble himself, as we also need not, with this double-aspect theory.

The Monistic contention, accordingly,—that there is no difference of substance between inorganic matter and living organisms,—is to be treated seriously only in its earlier form, according to which the vital actions of plants and the sensations of animals are but modifications of the primordial energy of the solar nebula; the motion assuming in living things more complex modes, to correspond with the more complex structure of the organisms into which it is received and in which it subsists; somewhat as the movements of a clock are but gravitation-energies cunningly distributed by means of a complex structure. Conversely, the aim of the advocates of difference of substance—between the inorganic world and living organisms—should be and is to show that vital actions, and in particular perception and feeling, could not result from any mere modification of chemical energy,

but must arise from and subsist in a principle or substance entirely different from the matter which sustains mechanical motion.

It should be remembered here that the advocates of substantial distinction admit (1) that living organisms are composed in part of the very same first matter which had previously entered into the constitution of inorganic substances; (2) that in becoming organized this matter takes on a much more complex form of structure than it had previously; with the result that (3) what may be called the mechanical actions of organs and even the conscious acts of the brain, have modifications much more complex than those of any inorganic agent. The highest organs, such as the human brain, derive a supply of chemical energy from food, and expend the supply in the actions they perform. The question at issue is thus found to be, whether, in addition to these complex forms of merely mechanical motion, whose existence is admitted,[2] it can be shown that there are other actions which it is impossible to conceive as modifications however complex and delicate, of any merely mechanical or chemical energy. If there are such, it is reasonable to suppose that, as they do not derive their specific character from any peculiar structure of matter, they subsist in and are sustained by an entirely different substance or semi-substance; which means that the difference between living organisms and non-living matter is substantial.

II. Subjects of Vital Actions.

In proof of their thesis it was natural for vitalists to point to the fact that though the energies of inorganic matter have been made to assume an indefinite variety of forms, corresponding to an equal variety of structures, the most pronounced Monists had till recently abandoned hope of giving it any of the manifold modes in which vital activity is manifested, except by making it pass into an organism already formed and endowed with life. This argument grows immensely in force if we take into account the peculiar character of conscious perception and feeling; for how can we imagine the motion of a hammer or a bullet becoming, by any twist or other modification, an act of consciousness or memory? We have seen how under stress of this reasoning many Monists have committed themselves to the extraordinary position that inorganic matter even in its most elementary forms is endowed with some kind of consciousness, however germinal.

[2]How far this statement applies to Mgr. Mercier's position will be considered in Section v.

Now, while it would be foolish to pretend to explain how the movements of inorganic matter may be transformed into vital actions, and especially into conscious perceptions and appetitions, it seems to me somewhat one-sided to insist on these mysteries without weighing against them the very serious difficulties with which the hypothesis of substantial or semi-substantial vital principles, distinct from matter, is attended. If I proceed to set forth difficulties of this class, it is not because of any conviction on my part that they are insuperable, but merely because I feel their force and have not met with any reasonable attempt at explanation in the works of the Schoolmen or their modern disciples. The way is not clear as pointed out by either party; but, as in the case of the substantial forms claimed for inorganic matter, it seems to me, a sympathizer with the doctrine of the Schoolmen, that the emanation of acts of perception and feeling from the substantial forms ascribed to animals, is as mysterious in many respects, to say the least, as the transformations of energy advocated by the Monists.

For, in the first place, however a vital action such as we now contemplate may be conceived to emanate from a substantial or semi-substantial principle of life or sense, it is never, even at its inception, found to subsist for an instant outside the organism. Take as an extreme case conscious sensation or sense-memory. No disciple of the Schoolmen supposes actions of this kind to emanate from or subsist for an instant in any simple principle, substance, or semi-substance. They emanate from some part of the nervous system and subsist only in the same; it is the organ, not any substance or semi-substance whereby it may be constituted in part, that thinks and remembers.

One could understand the need of a simple substance for purposes of sensation, if the act of consciousness were supposed to begin and subsist in the substance in question, as we suppose intellectual acts to subsist only in the spiritual soul of man,—not in his brain. But it is suspicious, to say the least, to find sensation represented as something essentially different from mechanical movement, and on that account needing to emanate from something different from matter, however modified in its structure; whilst in the next breath we are warned that the principle from which the sensation emanates is the material organ with its peculiar structure, and not merely the substantial form which it is supposed to need as a source. For it is a well-known part of the doctrine of the School that it is only true intellectual thought

and will that subsist in the spiritual faculties, all other actions—of sense-perception, memory, and appetition emanating from and subsisting in organs adapted to these acts.

III. Structure.

Consider, further, that an action cannot be conceived to subsist in an organ without participating in the mode of structure of the organ, according to the well-known axiom: *Quidquid recipitur ad modum recipientis recipitur.* The action of a bow on being received on a fiddle-string, is modified in shape to accord with the structure of the string; and it is the same all through nature, as far as we have any knowledge. Now, if sensation, as subsisting in an organ of peculiar structure, must be conceived to have its shape modified to suit the peculiarity of the structure in which it subsists, what ground is there for the contention that mechanical energy so received and modified must differ from a sensation? I confess I do not see how a conscious act can begin as an unconscious movement; the consciousness must be supposed to arise somehow with the new and very peculiar modification of structure which it receives.

It is admitted that the structure of the nerves and brain is exceedingly complex, and that the conscious acts of these organs participate in the complexity of the subject in which they are sustained. What if the consciousness were due to this complexity? Where the complex structure is not found there is no trace of consciousness; and the complexity increases with the range of the perception. This, of course, does not prove that it is the complexity precisely to which the consciousness is due; it merely raises suspicion, which is intensified by confirmatory evidence, and can be allayed only by evidence amounting to demonstration on the other side.

In this connection the results of Mr. Butler Burke's recent experiments are not without significance, tending, as they do, to show that if by any agency the precise form of complex structure which characterizes living cells could be produced artificially, the matter thus modified would be rightly said to live. It seems to be altogether a matter of begetting the structure. Hitherto only one class of agents,—those which are themselves alive and endowed with the peculiarity,—have been known to produce the desired modification. If, however, the progress of science should result in the discovery of some chemical or mechanical agent, like radium, whose action on some such substance as bouillon should be found to produce the desired

cell-structure, would not the actions of the nucleus so formed be regarded as vital? It would, of course, be open to the disciples of the Schoolmen to argue that the principle of the actions in question would be, not so much the artificially formed nucleus, as some substance or semi-substance which associates itself with such nuclei immediately on their formation, as the spiritual soul of man associates itself with the fœtus when a certain stage of development has been reached. There is no denying the possibility of such semi-substances; but the argument avails very little to disprove the possibility of the Monistic contention.

Nay, if we could proceed further and produce or discover an agent, not living, which might so act on inanimate matter or on hitherto unconscious living cells as to endow them with the exact type of structure possessed by the nerves and brain of a dog, would it not be reasonable to expect the matter so modified to become conscious of any motions it might have similar to the conscious movements of animals? That is, if we could produce the structure. But structure of any kind, no matter how complex, being what it is,—a mere figuration of matter due to its mode of extension in space,—have we the right to say not only that no such agents have been discovered, and that they are not likely to be discovered in future, but also that it is absolutely impossible that they should be?

The solar system—a pretty complex structure—resulted from the action of mechanical forces; Mayer's experiment goes to show that within the molecule the atoms assume a definite and often very complex order under the influence of a mechanical agent acting from without; the same holes of the flower-like forms seen in snow-flakes and the leaf-like structure of water crystallized by frost on a flag or window-pane. No doubt the structure of the living cell is much more complex; but how does it appear that an agent which was capable of developing less complex forms, might not ultimately succeed in producing a greater complexity?

IV. Qualification of Mechanical Movements.

The main positive argument hitherto advanced by Monists is based on the principle of the conservation of energy which practically all advocates of vital principles regard as governing the actions of plants and animals no less than those of inorganic matter. If, in addition to the physical, chemical, and other forces derived by organisms from without, they put forth, from their own store, as it were, a number

of vital actions whereby these borrowed energies are modified, how does it happen that the sum of energy possessed by the matter involved remains the same?

In two articles published in the *Dublin Review*[3] I have dealt with a reply to this argument—given for the most part by Frenchmen,—and have shown, as I think, that it is impossible by active external influence to change the direction of a motion without increasing its intensity; from which it follows either that the mechanical energies at work in living tissues are not directed by vital actions distinct from themselves, or that the sum of energy in the material universe is being constantly increased.

Some vitalists have suggested another solution of the difficulty, which will repay consideration as it appears to have grown in favor. It is to the effect that the office of the vital principle in living organisms is to modify the qualities of the mechanical energies received from without; and that modification of quality does not imply increase or decrease of quantity,—the two belonging to different categories. This view, set forth in France by Père Cuaoilhac, has been endorsed by Father Maher, whose able work on Psychology is so well known. Though both authors profess to deal only with the action of the spiritual will of man on the organs which it controls, it is plain that their contention, if true, would apply equally to all external interference with the actions of organized matter.

This raises a question as to the intrinsic physical constitution of qualities, and how far it may depend on the direction of the movements from which they result. In the case of a fiddle, for instance, there seems to be a qualitative difference not only between, say, the first and fourth strings, but even between the notes produced by the different lengths of either. So, too, in the case of colored glass; red glass differs in color—that is, in quality—from blue. The ordinary physicist now regards these and similar qualitative differences as due to and even consisting in difference of structure of the strings or the glass. This difference itself arises from the localization of the component molecules; which, in turn, plainly results from the direction of the motions whereby these particles were set in their present position. I know that many of those who advocate semi-substantial principles of life, regard qualities as similar realities of a more or less independent character. I hope to discuss the question fully at another time, contenting myself for the present with the

[3]July, 1902; July, 1904.

remark that this view is open to suspicion as having originated when light and heat were commonly supposed to be emanations of something more akin to substance than motion.

If, therefore, as we may well assume, difference of quality in material things is due to difference of location of the material particles; since we know that this localization assumes one mode or other according to the intensity and direction of the movements from which it results, it follows that qualities are modified by whatever agent succeeds in modifying the direction of the energies whereby they are produced. That is to say, you modify quality by modifying the direction of forces; so that Père Couailhac's solution of the difficulty before us, does not differ in substance from that of those who contended that it is possible to act from without on a closed system of forces so as to change their direction without increasing the sum of energy involved.

V. Modification Without Action.

I have said that advocates of vital principles—whereby living things would be differentiated in substance from inorganic matter—agree in deducing the necessity of these semi-substantial forms from the presence in living organisms of actions which cannot be reduced to mechanical energies however modified. Mgr. Mercier claims to have got rid of these vital actions, and with them of the reason assigned at the beginning of the last section for regarding the sum of energy in the universe as on the increase. For if vital principles do not act on the material system, as it were, from without, there is no reason why their interference should result in an increase of energy.

He states definitely that in the manifestations of vegetable life he sees only mechanical and physico-chemical forces, and that all the forces of living being may be reduced to the common forces of matter. Moreover, even in man the faculties of sense and locomotion are in their exercise subject to the law of the equivalence of the forces of nature, and must conform to the principle of the conservation of energy. What, then, is the function of the semi-substantial, vital principles which he advocates, and how is their presence shown? By a tendency in living beings to make these mechanical and physico-chemical forces converge towards the realization of definite ends or results,—ends which, in case of animals, he identifies with the conservation, the reproduction, the protection or the defence of the animal; in a word, its well-being.

Accordingly, his idea of a living organism seems to differ from that of the ordinary Monist in this, that whereas, according to both, the physico-chemical energies received from the inorganic world are made to converge towards special and definite ends, he attributes the convergence to the nature of the organism, as constituted not only by matter, but by semi-substantial forms of different kinds; while the Monists attribute it to the types of structure effected and conserved by movements coming from without.

How, then, precisely may we suppose the convergence to be effected in either system?

The average Monist, I take it, would reply that, whether in the inorganic world or the organic, matter, by reason of its impenetrability, has a power of deflecting movement; so that the convergence of food-energies in an animal system would be no more mysterious in this respect than the refraction of light by glass or the modification of the motion of a bow by a fiddle. Should you press for a further explanation as to whether these deflections are due to actions of the resisting media, the ordinary Monist, I again assume, would answer in the affirmative,—this time wrongly, as I am convinced. Monists, however, who believe that resistance is due to action, suppose this action to come to the resisting mass from without, having itself belonged to the system that existed from the beginning. Such an exercise of activity would not tend to increase the sum of energy in the universe.

As I understand Mgr. Mercier, he maintains that forces are made to converge, without being acted on, by the natures into which they are received; and that natures do this differently only if they differ in substance, and not merely in structure as the Monists suppose. It is not, he insists, as efficient causes but as natures tending each towards a different end that organisms make the physico-chemical energies they receive converge towards different types of form.

Well, possibly not as efficient causes; but does this prove the presence within the organisms, not only of matter under different types of structure but of substantial forms as well? Is it not owing to its peculiar type of structure that a clock makes the downward movements of gravitation converge so as to strike the hour? If you ask why an ordinary bar of brass cannot do as the clock does, that answer is: for want of structure; not because it has not the same nature, in the sense of substance, as the brass of which the clock is made. And so, perhaps, the reason why a block of limestone does

not think and feel, like a brain, is because, though the nature—in the sense of substance—of both is the same, in the brain it has a type of structure which it lacks in the limestone. For it is as true of moral units such as clocks and fiddles, as it is of physical individuals, that motion is received according to the mode of structure of the recipient.

If, indeed, it were the function of natures to emit, when acted on, forces altogether different from the actions of the agents whereby they were affected, rather than, as Monists suppose, to receive, modify, and transmit movements coming from without, Mgr. Mercier's position would be intelligible; and other works of his supply reason to believe that this is what he really means. Where, however, is the proof that the energy of a fiddle is altogether different from that of the bow or of the player's arm? that the energy of the arm issues *de novo* from the player's nature, and is not a modification of the food-energy which he took in? And if it were so, in what sense should we continue to say, as he says, that all the forces of living beings may be reduced to the common forces of matter; that the manifestations of vegetable life are due to mechanical and physico-chemical forces only; and that the function of vital principles is to make these forces converge?

VI. Intercorpuscular Spaces.

Dealing in my last paper[4] with the question of individual unity, I called attention to the difficulty of explaining how semi-

[4] "Pour pouvoir affirmer qu'il y a dans le végétal une force vitale d'autre nature que les forces corporelles en jeu dans le règne minéral, il faudrait pouvoir signaler, dans le complexus des phénomènes vitaux, au moins un phénomène positivement irréducible aux forces générales de la matière. Or il ne semble pas qu'il existe un seul phénomène de ce genre. Au contraire, au fur et à mésure que les sciences biologiques se devéloppent, nous voyons la mécanique, la physique et la chimie étendre de plus en plus leur empire sur les manifestations reputées les plus mystérieuses de la vie. Ainsi que nous avons déja fait remarquer, les deux grandes lois qui régissent l'univers matériel, celles de la conservation de la masse et de la conservation de l'énergie, semblent bien s'appliquer aux êtres organisés avec la meme rigueur qu'à la matière brute. Nous ne voyons dans les manifestations de la vie végétative que des forces mécaniques et physico-chimiques; et, par conséquent, si l'être qui vit est supérieur à celui qui ne vit pas, ce n'est pas à raison de l'irréductibilité de ses forces aux forces communs de la matière, mais à raison du mode spécial suivant lequel ces forces se déploient pour réaliser le but intrinsèque de la nature vivante, le bien-être de l'individu et la conservation de l'espèce." *Psychologie*, vol. i, p. 63.—"Les opérations des sens et de l'appétit sensitif ont pour sujet un organe, et les fonctions des organes sont soumises à la loi de la conservation de l'énergie."—"La volition est immanente; par le fait qu'elle s'accomplit l'appétit sensitif et la faculté locomotrice entrent en mouvement. Or ces deux facultés sont régies dans leur exercice par la loi de

substantial forms may subsist in the spaces between the atoms in molecules and the corpuscles in atoms. For these forms can subsist only where there is first matter disposed by suitable structure for their reception; and it is not easy to see how any matter that may be in the intercorpuscular spaces, say, of a mass of water, can have a structure adapted to the sustentation of a water-form. Apparently it is under pressure of some such consideration as this that advocates of the Scholastic theory have come to regard the molecule of water, whether in the liquid, gaseous, or solid state, as the unit of individuality.

Does organic chemistry afford any reason to suppose that the molecules of organisms are more continuous than those of inorganic matter? that the structure of an oak or a dog is more like that which a sponge presents to the uneducated mind, than it is to the structure of a gas as this appears to a chemist? Is every molecule as truly separate from all its fellows in the living organism as it is in a block of limestone? Experts in inorganic chemistry, I am persuaded, are practically agreed that it is; from which it is natural to conclude that in dogs no less than in limestone the unit of individuality is the molecule. This, however, leaves no room for the soul of the dog.

It will be said, I suppose, that even the human body is made up of spatially separated molecules, atoms, and corpuscles, and yet is informed by one soul. The point, in my opinion, needs explanation; for the present I can only say that as the human soul is a full substance it can exist apart from matter, and may, accordingly, be in the interspaces of the body, binding all the molecules into one true physical individual. At most the argument would prove merely the doctrine of Scotus—that the human soul is not the *forma corporeitatis*.

I do not wish to convey that the Monistic arguments set forth in this paper amount to demonstration, but only that they call for explanations more satisfactory than any I have seen. I have approached this question of specific distinction with a mind prejudiced, if at all, against the Monistic view; for every Catholic believes that

---

l'équivalence des forces de la nature et ne peuvent des lors compromettre la loi de la constance de l'énergie."—Vol. ii, pp. 153, 154. It is fair to add that in vol. i, p. 227, he teaches that "la perception sensible est une opération hyperphysique, c'est-à-dire d'une nature supérieure à celles dont sont capables les corps bruts et les substances organisées du règne végétal." A few pages further on, however, he maintains no less formally that "la perception sensible est essentiellement assujettie à la matière," the subjection involving "dépendance directe et intrinsèque" as distinguished from the indirect dependence on matter to which the human intellect is subject. All this, I must confess, is beyond my power to harmonize.

the human species differs in substance from all lower organisms; and substantial difference once admitted, one is disposed to apply the doctrine throughout nature, by analogy.

No doubt, it must be regarded as a triumph for the Materialists if they can show that there is no convincing reason why inorganic matter may not become alive and conscious without undergoing substantial change. One should bear in mind, however, that the main argument for the simplicity of the human soul is based on the conception of the necessary and the universal, not on life or sensation. If, in addition, it can be shown that corpuscular structure, as it is now conceived, does not unfit matter for the reception of a continuous form throughout an organism such as that of an oak or dog; and also that the sum of energy in the material universe is not of necessity increased by interferences which are not mere modifications of mechanical movement, I should see no reason to doubt that as man differs substantially from lower species, so perception and appetite are no mere modifications of physico-chemical energies, and difference is substantial wherever it is truly specific. The prominence I have given to these two bases of Monistic argumentation, is the measure of the importance which I attach to them in modern philosophy.

Walter A. McDonald.

"THE THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES"

(I—JOHN V—7*)

William L. Sullivan, C. S P.

"Readings at variance with the early copies cannot be right. . . . Why not go back to the original Greek, and correct the mistakes introduced by inaccurate translators and the blundering alterations of confident but ignorant critics? '—*St. Jerome.* Praef. ad quat. evan. ad Damasum.

"This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in water only, but in water and blood. And it is the Spirit that testified because the spirit is the truth. For there are three that give testimony (in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that give testimony on earth) the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are one."

This quotation comprises verses 6, 7, and 8 of the fifth chapter of the first Epistle of St. John. The words within parentheses are the famous Comma Joanneum, or text of the three heavenly Witnesses, which is considered by practically all independent critics to-day as spurious, that is to say, as not belonging to the original text of St. John. This conviction of the non-genuinity of the Comma Joanneum is so strong among modern scholars, that almost to a man they regard the question as definitely closed, and no longer admitting of respectable debate. "Efforts to defend this text," says Eberhard Nestle, "have only a pathological interest." ("Einführung in das griechische N. T." p. 260). "The authenticity of the words," says Scrivener, "will perhaps no longer be maintained by anyone whose judgment ought to have weight." ("Introduction to the criticism of the N. T." vol. 2, p. 104). Tischendorf remarks: "Apparet . . . verba quae de tribus testibus coelestibus dici solent, nullam prorsus fidem, auctoritatem nullam habere, nec a gravi libidinis aut imprudentiae crimine liberari posse eos qui etiamnum falsa quippe pietate

* Das Comma Joanneum: auf Seine Herkunft Untersucht. von Dr. Karl Künstle, a. o. Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. Br. St. Louis: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. 1905. Price, 90 cts.

ducti, libris sacris obtrudi patiuntur." (Gregory—Tischendorf's Greek N. T., vol. 2, p. 341). And long before Biblical criticism had reached anything like its present development, we might almost say before it existed in a scientific sense, Gibbon had flung his shaft against the text. In the thirty-seventh chapter of the "Decline and Fall." he says: "The memorable text which asserts the unity of the Three who bear witness in heaven, is condemned by the universal silence of the orthodox fathers, ancient versions and authentic manuscripts."

Naturally Catholics have been reluctant to accept this position—the Catholic instinct is to hold fast to the traditional interpretations until the evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. "Chez les Catholiques," said the Abbé Martin in the course of his articles written seventeen years ago to prove that the Comma Joanneum is spurious, "on procède avec plus de lenteur, de réserve et de mesure. Chez les Catholiques une question comme celle des trois temoins célestes n'est pas tranchée aussi vite que chez les protestants ou chez les rationalistes, et cela pour la simple raison qu' un fait traditionnel ayant une large base, même à un seul moment de l'histoire, est toujours de la part des Catholiques, l'objet d'une grande considération; il ne peut être rejeté comme faux ou douteux qu' aprés un sêrieux examen pour des raisons très graves, sinon absolument péremptoires" (*Science Catholique*, 1888-89, p. 17). Especially when a text is of such immense dogmatic importance as the Comma Joanneum, it is to be expected that Catholics, to whom dogma and dogmatic proofs are matters of life and death, will hold out against an apparently destructive criticism while an inch of ground remains to be contested. We have been brought up to regard this text as one of the strongest demonstrations of the Trinity. Our theologians give it a place of primary importance in their treatises *de Deo Trino*, and are apt to deal harshly with those who question its standing as an inspired utterance. The fourth thesis of Franzelin's *de Deo Trino* reads: "*Ex principiis theologicis textus* 1 *Jo. v-7 genuinus demonstratur.*" And in theco urse of his argument the eminent Jesuit uses the following severe language concerning the opponents of the text: "Quae quidem historia controversiæ ostendit multo magis præjudiciis et errore dogmatico quam argumentis criticis eas in hanc sententiam descendisse." Satolli in his *De Trinitate*, selects from Scripture three texts in proof of the triple personality of God, "textus peremptorios vel invictissimos," he calls them, of which I John v-7 is one. Finally there are two official declarations of ecclesiastical authority which, according to

some, definitely prohibit Catholics from questioning the genuineness of this controverted passage. The first is the Tridentine defin.: "Si quis autem libros ipsos integros, cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverant, et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit; A. S."[1] "*Cum omnibus suis partibus*", some strict theologians would tell us, are words which make it impossible to reject I John v-7, since this text is certainly a "pars" of one of the books of the Tridentine canon, as read in the "old and Vulgate version, *quæ . . . pro authentica habeatur.*"[2] But a Catholic critic need not be much worried about this in discussing I John v-7, since the Church has never defined what a "*pars libri*" may be, and since all the world recognizes that although the Vulgate must be regarded as containing the true and genuine substance of God's revealed word, still it is by no means absolutely free from mistakes, and the Council never intended to declare it so. The very decree of Trent which authorized the Vulgate was bitterly opposed by many Roman theologians on the ground that this version contained so many corrupt readings,[3] and anyone acquainted with the history of the Sixtine and Clementine editions will see at a glance how absurd it is to maintian that textual criticism came to an end when the Clementine Revisers furnished their labors in 1592.[4]

A graver obstacle in the way of the Catholic student who would undertake an impartial study of the Joannine text, seems to be the Inquisition's decree of 1897. Literally translated, this runs as follows: "In a general Congregation of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition held in the presence of the most eminent and reverend Lord Cardinals, Inquisitors General against heretical pravity, the doubt was proposed: 'Can it be safely denied, or at least doubted (in dubium revocari) that the text of St. John ep. 1: v-7, which reads: For there are three who give Testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are one, is authentic?' Having given a most diligent examination to this whole matter, and having ascertained the will of the Consultors, the most Eminent Cardinals gave order that the answer be, No! On Friday, the fifteenth

[1]Sess. IV. Decretum de canonicis Scripturis. This was reaffirmed in the Vatican Council; Const. dog. de fid. Cath. can. 4, de revel.

[2]Con. Trid. ib.

[3]Cornely, "*Introd. in S. Script.*" vol. i, pp 448-450.

[4]See the last chapter in Kaulen's *Geschichte d. Vulgate.*

day of January, 1897, in the customary audience granted to the Assessor of the Holy Office, His Holiness Leo XIII, when informed of the foregoing decision, approved and confirmed the answer of their Eminences." This decree which as Hetzenauer says came upon Catholic students "*wie ein Blitz aus heiterem Himmel*," looks indeed like a shutting and bolting of doors in the face of any further discussion of this text. But despite appearances we have the best of reasons for knowing that it is nothing of the kind. Very soon after the Inquisition had promulgated its decision, Cardinal Vaughan, acting upon official Roman information, wrote to Mr. Wilfrid Ward to assure him that the Holy Office had no intention of forbidding further investigations with regard to the genuineness of the passage, and no intention of restricting the field of Biblical criticism.[5] A conservative theologian like the Benedictine Janssens, Rector of San Anselmo in Rome, wrote in 1900 apparently in sympathy with the view that the text is a Priscillianist corruption. His words are naturally in the highest degree cautious, but they seem to justify the inference we have just expressed: "Haec hypothesis non est tam nostra quam eruditissimi simul ac piissimi viri, quocum nobis de praesenti argumento fusius colloqui nuper contigit."[6] In 1903 Aloysius Wurm in his study on the first Epistle of St. John declared that the material at hand does not scientifically justify the conclusion that St. John wrote the contested words.[7] Father Brucker S. J., certainly the last man in the wide world to be suspected of liberalism, says plainly that the decision of the Inquisition does not settle the matter. "The explanations," he goes on, "which Cardinal Vaughan received from Rome concerning this decree, prove that there was no intention of suppressing the legitimate liberty of sound criticism." Father Brucker then offers the following interpretation of the decree. It simply means, "that, the non-authenticity of the famous verse, not being yet proved, we should be in danger, by formally rejecting it, of sacrificing a very precious portion of revelation; and in these conditions it is wise to hold, at least provisionally, that it is authentic."[8] This explanation, all the stronger as coming from a man who personally believes in the text as genuine, certainly seems to do high-handed violence to the plain words of the decision of 1897. But whether violent or not, it is a type of many similar interpretations

[5] v. Hetzenauer's "*Wesen u. Principien d. Bibelkritik*," p. 198.
[6] Dr. Künstle's "Das Comma Joan." p. 57.
[7] In Bd. viii, Heft i, of Herder's *Biblische Studien*.
[8] *Etudes*, 1900, p. 403.

contrived by Catholic theologians to extricate themselves from the evidently uncomfortable position in which the Inquisition has placed them. For example, Dr. Künstle declares that the Inquisition merely meant to say (will nur sagen), that I John v-7 contains a dogmatically powerful witness to the Trinity-idea as this existed in the mind of St. John. With the intellectual or moral value of this sort of interpretation we wish to have nothing whatever to do. We are simply calling attention to the practical result of the decree of 1897, so far as freedom of investigation is concerned. This result is, that however the words of the Inquisition be undesrtood, refined away, or evaded, at all events they leave criticism with a free field in the examination of this text. This follows from the independent attitude of many theologians, and is attested by the appearance of such a book as we named at the head of this article, "*Das Comma Joanneum*," by Dr. Karl Künstle, Professor in the Catholic University of Freiburg. This little work has now been a full year before the public, and notwithstanding that it not only denies the genuineness of the Three Witnesses text, but maintains that it is the interpolation of the heretic Priscillian, it has met with no ecclesiastical censure, and is not likely even to provoke a serious reply.

Having made these preliminary observations which were designed to show that we have a right to such a critical examination as we shall forthwith begin, we are ready to approach the evidence for and against this celebrated text.

There are three classes of evidence to be studied in deciding whether a text has a valid standing in the New Testament, viz., Greek codices, ancient versions, and patristic quotations. It is often difficult to determine in a particular instance which of these is the most weighty in itself, and which is the best witness to the primitive autograph of the inspired author. For while, for example, the authority of our oldest uncials like the Vaticanus (B), or the Sinaiticus ℵ, is very great indeed, still a divergent reading from theirs which would be found frequently in fathers of the third century, would be preferred by many, inasmuch as it would be a century older and might represent a more ancient text. On the other hand it might be that the later uncial is really a better witness than those earlier Fathers, since it is possible that the fathers used a corrupt text, while the writer of the uncial took care to follow a purer one. The case would be still further confused by the well-known custom of many fathers to quote very freely and to trust to an uncertain memory. But however

complicated the apparatus of textual criticism, we may take it as a general rule of decisive authority that ancient Greek testimony is the highest standard possible to us for determining the true New Testament text. This is Tischendorf's first rule of textual criticism, and it is probably in the highest degree that it will stand as final.

Our question then will be, what is the Greek evidence for and against the validity of I John v-7? The answer is: Greek evidence is overwhelmingly, almost totally, against the text. The Greek uncials are our oldest New Testament manuscripts, going back to the period between the fourth and the tenth century. Every one of them that contains the first Epistle of St. John is without the Comma Joanneum. The two oldest of our New Testament manuscripts already mentioned, ℵ and B, date form the fourth century, and are *textus præstantissimi*, as Tischendorf calls them, and their immensely important evidence is against our text. The cursive manuscripts of the Greek New Testament, of vastly greater number of course than the uncials, belong to the period between the tenth and the sixteenth century. Of these cursives, about one hundred and ninety do not include the passage in their text of St. John's Epistle, and only four contain it. One of these four, the Codex Ravianus now in Berlin, is a very late manuscript, written after the invention of printing, and inasmuch as it is but a copy made from Cardinal Ximenes' Complutensian Polyglott Bible, its value as a text-witness is worthless. Another of the four is an eleventh century manuscript, the Codex Regius. Here again the evidence for I John v-7 is worthless, because this passage is written not in the body of the manuscript, but in the margin and, experts are of the opinion that it was thus added in the sixteenth or seventeenth century. The third of the four is the Codex Ottobanianus of the fifteenth century. This is a Græco-Latin manuscript in parallel columns, the Latin version being in the place of honor on the left, and according to textual students like Schalz, the Greek has been made to harmonize with the Latin. The very probability that this is true diminishes still further the evidential value of this codex, which at the best is not very great. The fourth and last Greek manuscript containing the Comma Joanneum is the Codex Montfortianus in Trinity College, Dublin, which dates from the sixteenth century. This too is worthless as a witness for our passage, first from its late date, and secondly because of the grave suspicion that rests upon it to the effect that it was written for the express purpose of inducing Erasmus to include the Comma Joanneum in the third edition of

his Greek New Testament.[9] He had excluded it from his first and second edition.

The testimony therefore of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, a testimony of very nearly decisive authority, is against I John v-7, with practically a unanimous voice. So powerful is this adverse verdict of the codices that nothing save proofs of the utmost weight to the contrary can set it aside.

There is another testimony of Greek antiquity which is hardly less momentous, some will consider it even stronger. The Greek fathers, as all the world knows, were greatly concerned with discussions on the Trinity. Before and after the Council of Nicaea, Irenæus, Origen, Hippolytus, Athanasius, Dionysius Alexandrinus, and many others undertook to explain, prove, and defend, the threefold divine Personality. In doing this they exhausted the resources of Scripture in Trinitarian texts. Yet not even one of the Greek fathers ever quotes the Comma Joanneum. Not even the protracted Arian controversy, brought this passage to light, though naturally it is of a character to be of immense assistance to an arthodox defence of the Three in One. No other conclusion can possibly be drawn from this except that the Greek fathers knew nothing about the text; and this for the reason that the New Testament manuscripts then known and used in the Greek world did not contain it. Cardinal Wiseman is moved by this cloud of witnesses against the text, to remark in his first letter in defense of the Comma: "Perhaps the strongest portion of evidence in favor of this long-contested passage, consists in the authority of Latin testimonies, the Vulgate, and the Latin fathers." The "perhaps" is unnecessary and misleading; the value of those Latin testimonies" we shall proceed to examine.

Before coming to that point, however, we must ask what the ancient versions or translations of the New Testament have to say in regard to our problem. We shall get from this enquiry an answer which goes far toward strengthening the position made out by the Greek manuscript and patristic authorities. The two Syriac versions, Peshitto and the Harkleian, the Coptic in both its dialects, the Sahidic and the Bohairic, the Ethiopic, and the Arabic, are as one in rejecting

[9]Erasmus was moved by the Codex Montfortianus to insert I Jo. v-7 in his third edition, but his letter to Stunica, the Complutensian editor, makes it clear that this was largely a concession to orthodoxy, "ne cui sit causa calumniandi." Erasmus says plainly that he suspects the Greek text of the Montfortianus to have been influenced in this passage by the Latin.

the disputed Comma. The few Armenian and Slavonic codices which contain it are either insignificant in number, or too late to be of much importance.

Only one source of evidence is left—the Latin. Is the Latin testimony strong enough to overcome the enormous weight of Greek and Oriental antiquity? The world's scholarship answers with an almost unanimous negative; but let us look at the evidence for ourselves. In the first place, of the great Latin fathers of the first four hundred and fifty years, not one has left us clear and undoubted proof that he was acquainted with the text of the Comma Joanneum. St. Jerome,[10] St. Augustine,[11] St. Hilary, and St. Ambrose have never quoted the text nor referred to it, notwithstanding that some of them have dealt *longe et late* with the Trinity. This fact is striking indeed, since if the verse is to be upheld at all, there is nothing but Latin testimony with which to uphold it. Coming now to the other side of the case, we find that the most powerful arguments in favor of the text which can be drawn from Latin antiquity is based upon this passage in the sixth chapter of St. Cyprian's "*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*": "Dicit Dominus, ego et Pater unum sumus'; et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, 'et tres unum sunt.'" This is the weightiest proof for the text, says Tischendorf, and beyond question it is. The Abbé Philippe, writing against the Abbé Martin on this question calls this Cyprianic passage, "peut-être même péremptoire dans la question." Is it peremptory? Does it decisively prove that St. Cyprian used a New Testament text which contained the Comma? And if we were made certain that St. Cyprian did use such a New Testament, should we be therefore justified in concluding that it gives us the true original of I John v-7? To answer this last question first, we must certainly say that even if it were undisputed that Cyprian's copy of the New Testament contained the Comma, it would by no means follow that the verse was written by St. John. A far more

[10]For a long time there was attributed to St. Jerome a *Prologus galeatus* to the Catholic Epistles which expressly states that I Jo. v-7, was left out of the Latin versions "ab infidelibus translatoribus." But this prologue is now known to be two centuries later than Jerome.

[11]As in the case of Jerome a work long thought to come from the pen of St. Augustine, contains the disputed verse. This is the *Speculum*, now edited in the *Corpus Script. Eccles. Latinorum*, vol. xii. The *Speculum* gives the verse in Priscillian's manner, the three earthly witnesses first, and the three heavenly witnesses second; and it adds "in Christo Jesu" to the "hi tres unum sunt," which follows the "Spiritus, aqua et sanguis." The work is not Augustine's, and Dr. Künstle gives impressive testimony to show that it originated in Spain or from a Spanish source.

probable inference would simply be that the interpolation is older than we thought. But it is not by any means clear that St. Cyprian is here quoting verse 7. Verse the eighth will be remembered, is: "the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are one." Now is it not possible that Cyprian is quoting this verse, and applying it in a mystical sense to the Three in heaven? Quibbles are destable, and a candid man will avoid them above almost any other form of intellectual dishonesty; but only when we consider, first that Cyprian does not literally quote the Comma; secondly, that the transition, by way of allegory, from the three that are one on earth, to the Three Who are one in heaven is easy and natural; and thirdly, that, as we have already seen, the antecedent presumption is entirely against the existence of the verse in Cyprian's time, we are warranted on the grounds of sane and cautious criticism, in holding that this passage of the great African doctor does not suffice to prove that I John v-7 existed in his day. Facundus[12] tells us expressly that in this passage Cyprian applies to the three divine Persons the unity which St. John assigns to spirit, water and blood. And we have a highly remarkable passage of St. Augustine which in a precisely similar manner allegorizes the three earthly witnesses so as to make them represent the Trinity. In the *Contra Maximinum*, Augustine says: "Si vero ea quae hic significata sunt velimus inquirere, non absurde occurrit ipsa Trinitas qui unus solus verus summus est Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, de quibus verissime dici potuit: Tres sunt testes, et tres unum sunt; ut nomine "spiritus," significatum accipiamus Deum Patrem . . . nomine autem "sangunis," Filium . . . et nomine "aquæ" Spiritum Sanctum." (C. Max. Bk 2, C. 22). This quotation makes it indisputably certain, "ganz evident," in Dr. Künstle's words that Augustine knew nothing of the Comma Joanneum,[13] and furnishes us with an exact type of the symbolical use of verse the eighth which we have attributed to his fellow-African St. Cyprian. If Augustine gives us an exegesis of verse 8, which is so like the controverted verse 7, why could not Cyprian have done a similar thing?

If now we turn from conjectural testimony to the first clear and explicit citation of the text of the Comma in a Latin author, we shall find it in the Liber Apologeticus of the Spanish heretic Priscillian,

---

[12]An African bishop who died about 570.

[13]As early as 1713, Dom Sabatier wrote concerning this text of St. Augustine's: "Il est plus clair que le jour que St. Augustin ne connaissait pas le verset 7"—quoted by Mangenot in Vigouroux' *Dictionnaire de la Bible.*

who died in 389. This remarkable man was already in possession of the sad celebrity of having been the first heretic to be put to death by the intervention of the secular arm; and now, it would appear, he is about to gain another title to an unfortunate immortality as the inventor of the text of the three heavenly Witnesses. About twenty years ago his works were discovered, and have since been edited by G. Schepss in the eighteenth volume of the Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. On the second page of the first tractate in Schepss's edition we read: "Sicut Johannes ait: Tria sunt quæ testimonium dicunt in terra, aqua, caro, et sanguis, et haec tria in unum sunt; et tria sunt quæ testimonium dicunt in cælo, pater verbum et Spiritus, et haec tria unum sunt in Christo Jesu." It will be noticed that in opposition to our present Vulgate reading, Priscillian places the three earthly witnesses first, and the three heavenly Witnesses second. This confusion in the words of the Comma, once it begins to find its way into Latin codices, is a striking characteristic of the textual history of the verse, and assuredly affords a new ground of suspicion against it. For example, some manuscripts have "testimonium dicunt," others "testimonium dant," and still others, "testimonium perhibent." Some give Priscillian's ending, "in Christo Jesu," others leave it out. Some read "quoniam tres sunt," others, "et tres," "et tria," and "quia tres." An eleventh century manuscript now in Paris has it thus: "Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in coelo, pater, verbum et spiritus. Et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, caro, sanguis et aqua; et hi tres in nobis unum sunt." Again the "hi tres unum sunt," after the naming of the three heavenly Witnesses is frequently omitted. From circumstances so evil-looking as these, a textual critic would be abundantly justified in holding it as probable that the verse has been dishonestly dealt with. And this, we think, is putting it mildly. It would be hard to find fault with a critic who would go further than this, and say that there are very few reliable and straightforward pages in the entire manuscript history of this verse.

We have not had an opportunity of showing at length how perfectly the Comma fits into the Trinitarian heresy of Priscillian. Of course the words can be, and in the ordinary course of things, would be, interpreted in a strictly orthodox sense. Priscillian is notoriously clever at expressing subtle heresy in apparently Catholic phraseology. He strenuously maintained that he was not a heretic, and once went to Rome to vindicate himself from the charge before Pope Damasus.

But he denied any distinction of Persons in the Deity. To him the words Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were merely verbal denominations, as they were to Sabellius, of the varied manifestations of the one Personality in God. Christ was personally not distinct from Father or Holy Spirit; all Three were one, not merely in nature, but in personality. "Haec tria unum sunt in Christo Jesu," exactly represents his mind, and it must have been a highly satisfactory formula to Priscillian, inasmuch as it not only conveyed his heresy, but satisfied unsuspecting orthodoxy.

Here, then, from this Spanish Gnostic we have the first indisputable mention of the texts that we are discussing. If he is really the author of it, as the Abbé Martin conjectured years ago, and as Dr. Künstle now does so much toward proving, all we can say is, that its source is a fit companion to its textual history.[14]

The only other Latin testimony,[15] outside the manuscripts of the Vulgate, which is of much value in behalf of the verse, is contained in the *De Trinitate* attributed to the African Vigilius of Thapsus (end of the fifth century); in two passages of Fulgentius of Ruspe (circa 500); and in a confession of faith presented by the African bishop to the Vandal King Hunneric in 484. In the first-named of these sources the Comma Joanneum is explicitly quoted three times; and up to five or six years ago, this was regarded as a strong proof that the verse was not of Spanish origin. But the recent researches of Ficker and Dom Morin seem to have made it clear, that the *De Trinitate* is not the work of Vigilius, and that it shows no inconsiderable

[14]We have not space to give in detail Dr. Künstle's arguments for the Priscillianist authorship of the Comma. For this point, and for the further matter of the medium through which the verse crept into the Latin New Testament manuscripts, see Künstle, pp. 45-57.

[15]I say "the only other Latin testimony," because the passage often quoted in favor of the Comma from St. Cyprian's letter to Jubaianus is too vague to be of much value as evidence; and the words of Tertullian's *Adv. Prax.* and *De Pud.*, likewise cited at times to the same purpose are worthless in this debate. In the *Ep. ad Jub.*, S. Cyprian asks how anyone baptized by a heretic can become the temple of God. "The temple of what God?" he inquires. "He cannot be the temple of the Creator . . . nor of Christ . . . nor of the Holy Spirit, *cum tres unum sunt quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est.*"

In the *Adv. Praxeam* Tertullian says: "Ita connexus patris in filio, et filii in paraclito tres efficit cohaerentes, alterum ex altero, qui tres unum sint, non unus. Quomodo dictum est: 'Ego et pater unum sumus,' ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeris ingularitatem." If anything is clear from this, it is that Tertullian knew nothing of I Jo. v-7.

The passage in the *De Pudicitia* is: "Ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est Spiritus, in quo est trinitas unius divinitatis, pater et filius et spiritus sanctus."

indications of having come from Spain. And of course, since Spain seems to be the country wherein the Comma arose and first spread, this seriously weakens the testimony of pseudo Vigilius in favor of this text.

Fulgentius of Ruspe certainly quotes the Comma in his *Responsio contra Arianos* and in the *De Trinitate.*

As for the profession of faith drawn up by the African bishops in 484, which also quotes I John 5-7, Künstle maintains that the style and theological scope of the document prove that it was strongly influenced by Spanish sources. But at all events, those two authorities, Fulgentius, and the *professio fidei* presented to Hunneric, demonstrate that in the latter years of the fifth century the text of the three heavenly Witnesses was known, accepted and honored in the Church of Africa.

The evidence that remains to be examined is that of the manuscripts of the Latin Bible. These manuscripts, by a very great majority, contain the Comma Joanneum. On the other hand, the Vulgate codices which are acknowledged to be the oldest and weightiest witnesses to the original Latin, do not contain it. The Codex Fuldensis of the sixth century, and the Codices Amiatinus and Harleianus of the eighth, possess an unsurpassed and perhaps unequalled authority among Vulgate manuscripts, and all three give no place to I John v-7. About the year 800, the monk Alcuin and the bishop Theodulf, both urged to the task by Charlemagne, brought out revisions of the Latin text. Alcuin naturally followed principally the codices familiar to England, and Theodulf of Orleans took as his *Grundtext*, the codices that prevailed in Spain. Alcuin's Bible omits the Comma, and Theodulf's contains it, as was perfectly natural if Spain be the fatherland of the verse. One of the very earliest witnesses to the passage is the Codex Cavensis, a manuscript of the eighth or ninth century preserved at Salerno. Much has been made of this codex by the defenders of the verse; but its authority is greatly weakened by the fact—for it is a fact hardly admitting of doubt—that it is of Spanish origin and has been influenced by the eighth century Codex Toletanus now in Madrid.

The question of how the interpolation passed the Roman *recensores* of the sixteenth century and became fixed in the official Clementine Vulgate is thus answered by the Abbé Martin. Theodulf introduced a corrupt text into France, which was still further thrown into confusion by various revisions, one by Lanfranc, the rule of whose corrections was, that all readings should be, "secundum orthodoxam fidem"; another by the Cistercian, Stephen Harding, in 1109;

another by the Dominican correctors in 1240; and still another, most important of all, by the doctors of the University of Paris, about the same time. This Paris edition was so bad that Roger Bacon wrote to the Pope, imploring him to prevent any further trifling with Holy Writ, informing him that the text given out by the Parisian doctors was "pro majori parte horribiliter corruptus," and that these incompetents had produced, "exemplaria vitiosissima" of the Vulgate. Finally in 1550, appeared the celebrated New Testament of Robert Stephen, which to a considerable extent followed this Parisian edition. Now when the Roman revisers set to work to bring out an official Vulgate text, they relied too much upon Stephen's edition; they had before them no Latin manuscripts older than 1220; and in the third place they thought that the spurious *Prologus galeatus*[16] to the Catholic epistles was the genuine work of St. Jerome. They were still further deceived by a statement of Robert Stephen's to the effect that the Greek manuscripts kept at Paris contained the Comma Joanneum. Accordingly they acted reasonably enough in retaining this verse. The mere fact of receiving as genuine the pseudo-Hieronymian prologue would justify them in doing so. And furthermore it is only fair to remember that the primary end and aim of the Clementine revisers was not to produce a new translation, nor to bring existing translations into harmony with the best Greek texts available, but simply to work back through varying Latin versions to as close a proximity as possible to Jerome's Vulgate.[17] This is what the Tridentine decree called for, and hence it is hardly just to judge the Clementine text simply and solely from the standpoint of the Hebrew and Greek. Of course the *Recensores* consulted the Hebrew and the Greek; but this consultation was less for the purpose of determining the purest possible Hebrew and Greek text, than for the purpose of throwing light upon the original Vulgate reading.

A summary of the evidence in the case may thus be given in conclusion:

Against the text of the Comma Joanneum are:

1. Greek antiquity without a dissenting voice. None of the Greek ecclesiastical writers for 1200 years seem to know anything of the text.

2. All the ancient Greek Mss. All the uncials, and 193 out of 197 cursives omit it.

[16]On this prologue see preceding note.

[17]v. Kaulen, *Gesch. d. Vulg.*, p. 483.

3. The ancient Oriental translations of Egypt, Syria, Ethiopia, Arabia.

4. All the great Latin Fathers: Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Hilary, etc., give no indication of ever having seen the text. The only possible exception, and that a very dubious one, is Cyprian.

5. The diversity of form in which the Comma appears, when once it begins to appear at all.

6. The oldest Mss. of the Vulgate.

7. The practically unanimous voice of modern scholarship.

In favor of the verse, we have:

1. Four worthless cursive Mss.

2. One very plausible and rather strong passage of St. Cyprian.

3. The three pseudonymous works of the *Speculum, the Prologus in epistolas Catholicas*, and the *De Trinitate* ascribed to Vigilius.

4. Fulgentius of Ruspe and the Hunneric profession of faith.

5. The great majority of Vulgate Mss.

6. The heretic Priscillian.

We think that not many impartial men, after examining the evidence in this controversy, will differ from Mangenot, who says in Vigouroux' "*Dictionnaire de la Bible*": "Les arguments défavorables à l' authenticité paraissent prédominer." But we cannot at all agree with him when he goes on to declare that loyalty to the Church should make every Catholic an upholder of this text, notwithstanding that criticism has spoken its verdict so strongly against it. Loyalty to the Church, is a phrase that should be carefully used; for have we not historic disasters to prove beyond dispute how unwise it is to identify the church with subordinate and reformable decisions, and to stake her authority upon matters which are predominantly within the province of secular science? Hetzenauer goes to the utmost limit of folly in this respect, by involving the infallibility of the Church in this dispute on the Comma. He says that to deny that the verse belongs to the inspired text, is to impute an "error gravissimus" to the "schola theologica." Whereupon he remarks: "Einer unfehlbaren Kirche ist aber ein solches crimen und ein solcher error gravissimus rein unmöglich."[18] Between rampant extravagance of this sort, and Dr. Künstle's candid, searching, and scholarly criticism, few intelligent men will hesitate to choose which is the better way of serving Catholicity in these modern days.

WILLIAM L. SULLIVAN.

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 192.

STUDIES

ATHENAGORAS: A PATRISTIC STUDY

Joseph Turmel

Writings. We have under the name of Athenagoras two books: an Apology entitled *Supplicatio pro Christianis*, and a didactic treatise on the Resurrection (*De Resurrectione*). The *Apology* is addressed to Marcus Aurelius and his son, Commodus. It supposes the latter as, already associated with his father in the government of the Empire—a fact which indicates a date of composition later than November 27, 176. On the other hand, it says that the Roman Empire was enjoying a profound peace—which was no longer true in 178.[1] It seems therefore to have been written in 177. As for *De Resurrectione*, it must be placed later; at least, so we are led to understand by a note which we read at the end of the *Apology*.[2]

Transmission. Authenticity. The two writings just named have come down to us in different manuscripts, all of which are derived directly or indirectly from the collection composed in 914 by the order of Arethas. It is therefore the Arethas Codex which is in reality the sole instrument of transmission.[3]

As for attestations, what strikes one most is their absence where one would most expect to find them. Neither Eusebius nor St. Jerome nor Photius knew of Athenagoras. On the other hand, Methodius quotes an extract from the *Apology*,[4] and Philip of Side mentions it.[5] Minucius Felix seems to have made use of it but without naming it. *De Resurrectione* has no evidence of authenticity except the Arethas Codex.

---

[1]Tillemont, *Notes sur la persécution de Marc-Aurèle*, x, t. 2, p. 571 (ed. 1894); Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristl. Litt.*, I, 317, 710.

[2]*Suppl.* 36. cf. Maran, *Præf.* III, 13, 5, in Migne, *P. G.*, VI. 187; Harnack, l. c., p. 318.

[3]Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, I, 256.

[4]He cites a passage of *Legat.* 24. His citation is supported by Epiphanius (*Hær.* 64, 20), Photius (*Cod.* 234). It has been found in the Bulgarian version of *De Resur.* (Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, I, 258.

[5]Harnack, l. c.; Maran, l. c., p. 182.

The Author. Neither the *Supplicatio pro Christianis* nor the *De Resurrectione* affords us any information about the life or even the name of the man who wrote them. We know him therefore only by tradition, and this tells us very little. The name of Athenagoras appears for the first time—at least in a certain way—in Methodius, but without any details. Philip of Side speaks of him as a native of Athens and as the first master of the School of Alexandria. This latter statement is very doubtful. In fact the notice given to Athenagoras by Philip of Side contains statements which are clearly shown to be errors.[6] The Arethas-Codex speaks of Athenagoras as "an Athenian philosopher." This indication is perhaps borrowed from Philip of Side. We do not know what it is worth. The Alexandrian Boethius, who lived about 180, refers to an Athenagoras to whom he attributes a study on Plato. If this is our Athenagoras, we have some basis for saying that the author of the *Apology* and *De Resurrectione* lived at Alexandria. But the identity of the two is a pure conjecture.[7]

Analysis. Written with profound deference and respect for the emperors to whom it is addressed, the *Apology* of Athenagoras aims at exculpating the Christians from the crimes with which public opinion then charged them: atheism, the repast of Thyestes, and incestuous relations.[8] It is divided accordingly into three parts, and shows successively that the Christians are not atheists (4-30); that they are not given up to impurity (31-34); that they are not cannibals (35-36). As is evident, the first section is much the longest. It is subdivided into two parts. In one (4-12) Athenagoras declares that the Christians profess monotheism. In this connection he proves monotheism by the authority of the poets and philosophers, by reason, and by the Scriptures. In the other part he examines the grounds on which the accusations of atheism rested. The Christians were reproached with not taking part in the sacrifices, and with not adoring the gods of the places in which they lived. Athenagoras answers that God has no need of blood or fat or incense. He adds that the gods have no sort of right to our worship, and justifies his assertion by various considerations, drawn especially from the scandalous deeds narrated of them (13-23). Then, considering the objection that wonders are worked around the statues of the gods, the Christian

[6]Cf. Maran and Harnack, as indicated above.
[7]Harnack, l. c.
[8]*Supplic.*, 3.

philosopher answers that he does not contest the reality of these wonders, but only the source to which the pagans attributed them. Here he takes up the question of angelology and gives the history of the demons who are, in his opinion, the true authors of the prodigies attributed by the pagans to the gods (24-30). In the two last sections, which are very short, the innocence of the Christians is deduced from their belief in God, in judgment, and in the resurrection.

De Resurrectione is a demonstration of the resurrection based exclusively on reason. It is divided into two parts. The first (2-20) is intended to solve the objections of the pagans against the return of bodies to life. The second (11-25) gives the bases of Christian belief. The whole is preceded by a rather heavy dissertation on the comparative merits of the method of exposition and the method of refutation (1). The objections against the resurrection are grouped about these two questions: Can God bring bodies back to life? Does He wish to do so? Athenagoras takes up successively these two problems. The second does not take him long (10). He easily proves, not that God really wishes the resurrection, but that there is nothing in the way of His wishing it. The first problem would also find an easy solution in the consideration of the divine omnipotence, were it not for the serious difficulty of bodies devoured by beasts which in their turn are eaten by men. How can the elements return to a body to which they once belonged when they now belong to another? Athenagoras states the difficulty honestly and offers a solution which we shall see further on (4-8). Having thus prepared the way, our philosopher passes to the proofs from reason for the resurrection, but not without giving us once more his views on method (12). Three facts appeal to him as demanding the resurrection: the destiny of man, his nature, and the judgment which he is to undergo. The resurrection is demanded first of all by our destiny (12-13); we have been created not to serve beings of a higher order, as the animals to serve us, but to live. Accordingly, existence should be our lasting possession, and therefore we should recover it when death has momentarily robbed us of it. It is demanded, in the second place, by our nature, which is made up of two elements, which have equal rights to live (15-17). It is demanded finally by judgment, which is the necessary complement of life, and which, moreover, must be applied to the body as well as to the soul (18-23). Here Athenagoras, who had announced only three proofs, adds a fourth drawn from the end of man (24-25).

DOCTRINES.

God; His Attributes. God is without beginning; He is impassible and indivisible. He is therefore not composed of parts.[9] We distinguish God from matter; we prove that matter is one thing, and God another, and that there is an abyss between them. The divine Being is unbegotten; He is eternal; and invisible except to spirit and to reason. Matter, on the contrary, had a beginning and is corruptible.[10] God has not made man in vain for He is wise, and the wise does nothing in vain. Nor has He made him for His own use, for He has need of nothing.[11] If the world is made, it is not because God had need of it; God is fully sufficient unto Himself. He is Light inaccessible, a perfect World, a Spirit, a Force, a Reason.[12]

Monotheism. As we have said, Athenagoras proves monotheism by profane authority, by reason, and by the authority of Holy Writ. His proof from profane authority is drawn from Euripides, Sophocles, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, and others.[13] He is satisfied with slight indications. He sees monotheism in verses of Euripides which refer to the ether; he finds support among the Stoics, even though he recognizes that their God is in so slight degree a personal one. For his Scripture proof he quotes four texts of second-Isaias,[14] and refers his august readers to Moses, Jeremias, and the other prophets. As for his proof from reason, it runs as follows: "If there were from the beginning two or more gods, they were either in one and the same place, or each of them separately in his own. In one and the same place they could not be. For, if they are gods, they are not alike; but because they are uncreated they are unlike; for created things are like their patterns; but the uncreated are unlike, being neither produced from anyone, nor formed after the pattern of anyone." Further on we read: "If each of them exists separately, since He that made the world is above the things created and about the things He has made and set in order, where can the other or the rest be? For if the world, being made spherical, is confined within the circles of heaven, and the Creator of the world is above the things created in order to watch over them, what place is there for the second god, or for the

[9] *Ibid.* 8.
[10] *Ibid.* 4.
[11] *De. Resur* 12.
[12] *Suppl.* 16.
[13] *Ibid.* 6.
[14] n. 9.

other gods? He cannot dwell in the world, since it belongs to the first God; nor about the world, for there resides the God who made it. But if he is neither in the world nor about the world—for all that surrounds is occupied by the Creator—where is he? Is he above the world and God? In another world, or about another? But if he is in another or about another, then he is not about us, for he does not govern the world; nor is his power great, for he exists in a circumscribed space." He goes on to argue that this hypothesis is absurd because our world occupies all space, and we cannot conceive another god within or about another world. Nor can he be located above the God who made our world, for God fills all the regions about the world.[15]

The Divine Immensity. The reasoning we have just seen indicates how Athenagoras conceives the divine immensity. According to him, God is above (or rather around) the world; but He keeps at the circumference; He does not enter in; He is not in the world. We may add that God, who envelops the world, has all the appearance of being extended. We have seen, it is true, that Athenagoras declares that God is not composed of parts; but by this he wishes to say, no doubt, that the divine substance is homogeneous and that it has not organs.

Providence. We read in the *Apology* that God abides above the world to watch over His works.[16] And *De Resurrectione* contains the following declaration: "It is incumbent on those who admit God to be the Maker of this universe to ascribe to His wisdom and rectitude the preservation and care of all that has been created, if they wish to keep to their own principles; and with such views to hold that nothing in earth or heaven is without guardianship or providence; but that, on the contrary, to everything, invisible and visible, small and great, the attention of the Creator reaches; for all created things require the attention of the Creator, and each one in particular, according to its nature and the end for which it was made."[17] Athenagoras therefore believed in Providence—but how did he conceive it? The following passage from the *Apology* will show: "God has destined the angels to watch over His empire. God reserves unto Himself the universal and general providence; as for particular providence, He hands that over to the angels."[18]

---

[15] n. 8.
[16] n. 8.
[17] *De Resur.* 18.
[18] *Suppl.* 24

Trinity. While proclaiming the Unity of God, Athenagoras believes in the Trinity. He says: "Who would not be astonished to hear men called atheists who believe in God the Father, and in God the Son, and in the Holy Spirit, and who declare both their power in union and their distinction in order?"[19] And again: "We acknowledge a God, and a Son his Logos, and a Holy Spirit, united in essence —the Father, the Son, the Spirit, because the Son is the Intelligence, Reason, Wisdom of the Father; and the Spirit an effluence, as light from fire."[20] And in another place we are told that the Christians are led on by a desire to know "what is the union of the Son with the Father, and what the communication of the Father to the Son, what is the Spirit, and what is the unity of these three, the Spirit, the Son, and the Father, and their distinction in unity."[21] The texts just cited manifest a belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and at the same time indicate an order or hierarchy among them. Further light will be thrown on this latter question in the succeeding sections.

The Logos. In different places in the *Apology* we meet with the expressions: "God has made all things by the Logos;[22] God has made all things by the Logos which is from Him."[23] We see from this that the Logos of Athenagoras is the minister whom God has used to create the world and to set it in order. One of these formulæ also shows us that the Logos has come forth from God,[24] and therefore that He has God for His source. The following passage develops this idea: "We acknowledge a Son of God. Nor let anyone think it ridiculous that God should have a Son. . . . The Son of God is the Logos of the Father as model and principle of operation;[25] for after the pattern of Him and by Him were all things made,[26] the Father and the Son being one. And the Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son, in oneness and power of spirit, the understanding and reason (Logos) of the Father is the Son of God. But if, in your surpassing intelligence it occurs to you to inquire what is meant by the Son, I will state briefly that He is the first product of the Father,[27]

[19] *Ibid.* 10.
[20] n. 24.
[21] n. 12.
[22] n. 6.
[23] n. 4.
[24] Note the formula ὁ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγος (nn. 12, 18, 30).
[25] n. 10.
[26] *Ibid.* The reading is πρὸς αὐτοῦ, but the context demands. πρὸς αὐτὸν
[27] *Ibid.*

not as having been brought into existence (for from the beginning God, who is eternal Mind, had the Logos in Himself,[28] being from eternity instinct with Logos (λογικός) but inasmuch as He came forth to be the exemplar and energizing power of all material things, which lay in chaos. The prophetic Spirit also agrees with our statements when it says: 'The Lord made me the beginning of his ways to his works!'"[29] Let us now sum up the principal thoughts in this little dissertation. (a) The Logos had no beginning. He was from the beginning in God, and this of necessity, since God, being always possessed of reason, could never have been without the Logos. (b) However, His condition of "production," that is to say, of "Sonship," does not arise from His eternal presence in God. It arises from the fact that the Logos "has come forth" to be the exemplar and source of the universe. Athenagoras declares distinctly that the Logos is a product, not as having been made, but as having come forth. (c) The Logos therefore has had two states of being—the first, from all eternity in God; the second, when He came forth from God to fashion the world. (d) It is by His coming forth from the bosom of the Father that He becomes produced or begotten—a Son. While He was in God He was not a Son—He was just an attribute. The Logos-attribute is eternal; the Logos-Son is not. In other words, the generation of the Word took place in time; its reason was the production of the world; it consisted in the coming forth of the Logos from the bosom of the Father.[30]

The Holy Trinity. We have already seen the statement of Athenagoras that the Holy Spirit is "an effluence" from divinity, as light is from fire. We read in another passage of the *Apology* that "the Holy Spirit which works in the prophets is an effluence from God, flowing from Him, and returning again like a beam of the sun."[31] This Spirit which flows from the divine essence and returns to it, has no marks of a Personality distinct from that of God the Father. Hence we can conclude that the Trinity of Athenagoras comprises: an eternal hypostasis which becomes Father at the time when the Logos goes forth from his bosom; a second hypostasis, eternal as an attribute of God, but, as hypostasis, having a beginning when the Logos was be-

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Note here that the matter seems to exist, though in a formless state, when the Logos emerges from the bosom of the Father. His mission is not therefore to create it, but only to set it in order.

[31] n. 10.

gotten and became Son; a divine operation, which does not possess personal existence.

Angels and Demons. After having spoken of the Trinity, Athenagoras adds: "Nor is our teaching in what relates to divinity confined to these points; for we recognize also a multitude of angels and ministers whom God the Maker and Framer of the world distributed and appointed to their several posts by His Logos, to occupy themselves about the elements, and the heavens, and the world, and the things in it, and the goodly ordering of it all."[32] Elsewhere also he follows up a mention of the Trinity with a similar remark: "We also apprehend the existence of other powers which exercise dominion over matter and make use of it for their ends."[33] In this connection he sets forth his theory of special providences being committed by God to the angels. (Vide supra).

The angels were created free.[34] "Some continued in those things for which God had made and over which He had set them; but some profaned both their own nature and the power confided to them."[35] Athenagoras here distinguishes from the mass of the angels "placed about the first firmament" a "spirit created by God like the other angels, and entrusted with the control of matter and its forms." He goes on to tell us that "the chief of matter and its forms . . . became negligent and wicked." As for the others, some of them "fell into impure love of virgins, and were subjugated by the flesh."[36] These fallen angels are now in the air and on the earth. They lead men to concupiscence. They have with them their children, the fruit of their connection with women. These are called giants or demons, and these demons also act upon men.[37] As for the "prince of matter," he strives in every way to overthrow the government of God.[38] He is "anti-God."[39]

Inspiration of the Scriptures. The *Apology* affords for the dogma of inspiration its most celebrated attestations. In it we read: "We have for witnesses of the things we believe prophets, men who have pronounced concerning God and the things of God, guided by the

[32] n. 10.
[33] n. 24.
[34] *Ibid.*
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] n. 25.
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] n. 24.

Spirit of God. . . . It would be irrational for us not to believe in the Spirit from God, who moved the mouths of the prophets like musical instruments. . . . [40] You are not ignorant of the writings of Moses or of Isaias and Jeremias, and the other prophets, who, lifted in ecstacy above the natural operations of their minds, by the impulses of the Divine Spirit, uttered the things with which they were inspired, the Spirit making use of them as a flute-player breathes into a flute."[41]

Sacrifice. The pagans, who "measure piety by sacrifices," blame the Christians for not joining in their rites. After having replied that God has no need of the blood of victims, Athenagoras adds: "The most precious sacrifice in His eyes is to know who stretched out and vaulted the heavens and fixed the earth in its place as a centre, who gathered the waters into seas and divided the light from the darkness. . . . When we lift up holy hands to Him, what further need have we of a hecatomb? . . . And what have I to do with holocausts, which God does not stand in need of? What is needed is to offer an unbloody sacrifice and a reasonable service."[42] Sacrifice then consists in knowing God and in raising unspotted hands to Him.

Marriage; Celibacy; Second Marriages. The accusation made against the Christians of indulging in horrible debauches during their meetings is repelled in the following terms: "Therefore, having the hope of eternal life, we despise the things of this life, even to the pleasures of the soul, each of us reckoning her his wife whom he has married according to your laws, and that only for the purpose of having children. For as the husbandman throwing his seed into the ground awaits the harvest, not sowing more upon it, so to us the procreation of children is the measure of our indulgence in appetite. Nay, you would find many among us, men and women, growing old in celibacy, in the hope of living in closer communion with God. If virginity and celibacy lead near to God, while the indulgence in carnal thought and desire leads away from Him, how can we give ourselves up to the deeds when we reject the very thoughts? . . . A person should either remain as he was born or be content with one marriage; for a second marriage is only a specious adultery. For it is said: 'Whoever puts away his wife and marries another, commits adultery'; it is not permitted a man to send away her whose virginity he has brought to an end, nor to marry again. For he who separates himself from his

[40] n. 7.
[41] n. 9.
[42] n. 13.

first wife, even though she be dead, is a cloaked adulterer, resisting the hand of God, who made in the beginning one man and one woman."[43]

Hence we see: (a) celibacy is superior to marriage; (b) many Christians, men and women, keep celibacy; (c) married Christians make use of their marriage only to have children; (d) the marriage bond is dissolved only by death, and second marriages constitute a cloaked adultery, condemned by the Savior in the Gospel, and by God in the beginning of the world.

Psychology. Athenagoras says that men "bear in themselves the image of their Creator."[44] He also attributes to them "an affinity with the afflatus from God."[45] Unfortunately, these phrases are thrown out as it were in passing, and are not accompanied with explanations which would be necessary for us to determine their meaning clearly. There is room, however, to believe that in his mind it is the soul itself which is the image of God and which has an affinity with the divine afflatus. According to this conjecture, Athenagoras would not belong to the school of Tatian, who attributes the image of God to the divine spirit which is present in the souls of virtuous men, but is distinct from the soul itself. In scholastic terminology, man according to Athenagoras is the image of God by nature; according to Tatian he is the image of God by grace. Furthermore, if this affinity with the divine afflatus is what we have taken it to be—something inherent in the nature of the soul—it cannot be considered as a modified version of the "seminal Logos" of Justin, which, like the divine spirit of Tatian, is distinct from the soul.

Athenagoras differs from Tatian on another point also. He teaches that the soul after death possesses "an unchangeable continuance,"[46] while the body will receive incorruptibility only after a change. Tatian, on the contrary, submits the soul itself to the law of decomposition. Moreover, the author of *De Resurrectione* seems to believe that the soul cannot have conscious life without the body.

---

[43]n. 33.

[44]*De Resur.* 12.

[45]*Suppl.* 7. Here Athenagoras says that the philosophers and poets have been moved, each one by his own soul, according to their affinity with the afflatus from God. Taken strictly, the afflatus from God might be understood as having inspired the philosophers and poets—a theory akin to the "seminal Logos" of Justin. But it seems more in accordance with the text to say that the philosophers and poets were led of themselves to seek the truth, on account of their affinity with the afflatus from God.

[46]*De Resur.* 16.

He says, in the course of his treatise on the resurrection: "If both understanding and reason have been given to men for the discernment of things by the understanding, and not of existences only, but of the goodness and wisdom and rectitude of their Giver, it follows that the human reason should continue as long as the objects for which it has been made. But it cannot endure unless the nature which received it and in which it inherits also endures. But that which has received understanding and reason is man, not the soul itself. Man, therefore, who consists of two parts, must continue forever. But it is impossible for him to continue unless he rise again."[47] Taken literally, this reasoning would lead to the view that the intellectual faculty belongs to the human composite, and that it cannot subsist when the composite is destroyed. However, such an interpretation would misrepresent the thought of Athenagoras. If he says that reason belongs to the composite, it is because he believes that the moral reasons which we shall presently advert to demand the maintenance of the union of body and soul. But he accounts reason as a faculty of the soul alone, and nothing authorizes us to think that he looks upon the body as being necessary for rational life.

Resurrection. In his statement of the proofs of the resurrection, Athenagoras sometimes advances arguments to show that man is made to live forever, overlooking the fact that considerations of such sort tend simply to establish the title of the soul to immortality. However, he is not always satisfied with generalities, and, grappling with the question at closer range, he explains why the body must be associated with the soul in the future life. It is this part of his argument which attracts our attention.

His first proof for the resurrection of the body is drawn from the nature of man: "The whole nature of man is composed of an immortal soul and a body fitted to it at the time of its creation. God has not given existence and life either to the soul alone or to the body alone, but to the composite which results from the two and which is called man." Athenagoras then argues that if this partnership is to be completely dissolved, God would have instituted it in vain—which cannot be conceived. He writes: "If the nature of men does not continue, in vain has the soul been fitted to the needs of the body and to its experiences; in vain has the body been fettered so that it cannot obtain what it longs for . . . in vain the practice of virtue . . . in

[47] *Ibid.* 15.

vain the very creation and nature of men. Now God can do nothing in vain, and none of His gifts can be bestowed in vain; therefore there must necessarily correspond with the immortality of the soul an equal duration of the body according to its proper nature."[48]

Judgment furnishes another proof for the resurrection. The merit inherent to the practice of virtue does not belong to the soul alone; the body also has its share in it. So too, the soul is not alone responsible for sin, since it is drawn and driven to sin by the body; the body therefore should have its share in the reward or punishment of the soul. A judgment passed on the soul alone would be absolutely unjust, and hence impossible to God. Such, in brief, are the considerations found in nn. 18-23.[49] In the course of his argument, Athenagoras makes a statement which is hardly in accord with his general position, viz., that the body draws the soul into actions to which the latter is indifferent. However, he corrects himself, and affirms strongly the unity of the human composite: But "even if we hold that these affections do not pertain to the body alone, but to man—in saying which we should speak correctly, because the life of man is one, though composed of the two—yet surely we shall not assert that these things belong to the soul, if we consider it in itself."[50]

The dogma of the resurrection has therefore a basis in human nature. But there are objections to be considered; and of these the most terrible is that of human bodies which, directly or indirectly, have been eaten by men. To solve this difficulty, Athenagoras says that we must not confound the food taken into the body with the elements which become a part of the organism. The nutritive portion is only that which is suited to our nature; the remainder is separated and eliminated by one or the other of the three processes through which it must pass—in the stomach, the liver, and the members. These principles being established, our apologist asserts that human flesh contains no nutriment for man. Hence he concludes that if such flesh enters into our organism it is always ejected, and can therefore serve to reconstitute the body to which it originally belonged.[51]

Immortality of the Soul; Disembodied Souls. We have already remarked that some of the arguments advanced by Athenagoras for the resurrection apply to the soul rather than to the body. He

[48] *Ibid.*
[49] Especially n. 18.
[50] *Ibid.* 21.
[51] *Ibid.* 5 and 8.

proves the permanence of the soul after death: (a) by the fact that man is made, not to serve other beings, but to live; (b) by the privilege which the soul possesses of being made in the image of God, and of knowing Him and the essences which are perceived by reason—whence it follows that it should last as long as the objects of its activity; (c) by the necessity of a sanction for the moral life—a sanction which our present existence does not afford.[52]

He adds, however, that this sanction is not applied before the resurrection. "It is the composite of soul and body," he says, "that is, man, which is to be called to account for its actions. Now this does not take place in the present life. . . . nor after death when the soul is separated from the body, and the latter is in a state of decomposition."[53] Elsewhere he says that the soul cannot with justice be judged alone for sins to which, considered in itself, it has no tendency.[54] Evidently he puts off the judgment until after the resurrection, and he has no knowledge of what we call the particular judgment. He does not, however, present any opinion concerning the state of the separated souls.

The Future Life. We read near the close of *De Resurrectione* that the end of human life consists in the "contemplation of Being."[55] And the *Apology* teaches that "when we are removed from the present life, we shall live another life, better than the present one, heavenly, not earthly, for we shall abide near God and with God, free from all change and suffering in the soul, not as flesh, even though we shall have flesh, but as heavenly spirit."[56] Such will be the life of the just after the resurrection. As for the wicked, they will be judged and punished "by fire."[57]

Citations From Scripture. Athenagoras cites two texts from Exodus,[58] two from Proverbs,[59] three from Isaias,[60] three from St. Paul,[61] and four from St. Matthew.[62] The quotations from Exodus

[52] *Ibid.* 12, 15, 19, 18.
[53] *Ibid.* 18.
[54] *Ibid.* 20.
[55] *Ibid.* 25.
[56] *Suppl.* 31. This refers to life after the resurrection, since he speaks of the elect as being in the flesh.
[57] *Ibid.*
[58] *De Resur.* 23.
[59] *Suppl.* 10, 18.
[60] *Ibid.* 9.
[61] *De Resur.* 18; *Legat.* 12 and *De Resur.* 19. It is in the two latter passages that the citations are tacit. However, it is proper to note that the citation bears on the

are precepts used in a context where there is question of the will of God; these precepts are therefore attributed to God. The texts from Proverbs are introduced by the formulas: "The Holy Spirit confirms this"; "The prophetic Spirit says." The extracts from Isaias are given in the place where the action of the Holy Spirit on the prophets is proclaimed in terms which we have already seen. Of the three citations from St. Paul two are used without reference given, and the third begins with the formula: "According to the saying of the apostle." The passages from St. Matthew are drawn from the words of the Savior. One of them is given in answer to the question: "What are the precepts of God on which we nourish ourselves?" The others are tacitly attributed to the Savior by means of the rather vague formula: "He says." In fine, Athenagoras makes reference to inspiration only in connection with passages drawn from the Old Testament.

The Fall. After having shown that the body as well as the soul should be immortal, he faces the difficulty: the body dies and falls into dust. He answers that the interruption of life produced by death is at bottom similar to that caused by sleep, only the former is longer. Now sleep is not considered as destroying the continuity of life; neither then does death. True, the body does not reach immortality at one stride, like the soul; but then, it is not of the same nature. Man cannot aspire to the same method of continuance as immortal essences —his nature prevents it.[63]

Such is the solution which the author of *De Resurrectione* gives to the problem of death. Pelagius would certainly not have disavowed

---

expression: Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we may die; which St. Paul puts into the mouth of the wicked, and which has no title to inspiration.

[62] *Suppl.* 11, 12, 32, 33.

[63] *De Resur.* 16: "Let no one think it strange that we use the term continuance of a life which is cut short by death and corruption; but let him consider rather that this word has not one meaning only, nor is there only one measure of continuance, because the nature also of things that continue is not one. . . . Men, in respect of the soul, have from their first origin an unchangeable continuance, but in respect of the body obtain immortality by means of change. This is what is meant by the doctrine of the resurrection; and looking to this we await the dissolution of the body as the sequel of a life of want and corruption, and after this we hope for a permanence in incorruptibility, not putting our death on a level with the death of irrational animals, or the continuance of man with the continuance of immortals, lest we should unawares in this way put human nature and life on a level with things with which it is not proper to compare them." Then follows the comparison of sleep with death, which is only a longer sleep.

it, and St. Augustine would have opposed it to the utmost. Athenagoras seems to have been unaware of the dogma of the Fall. Such being the case, we should scarcely expect to find in him the doctrine of Original Sin. And indeed he tells us that the soul is "an unblemished spirit" up to the time when, drawn down by earthly things, it becomes flesh and blood.[64]

JOSEPH TURMEL.

[64] *Suppl.* 27.

THE XIVth CHAPTER OF GENESIS

IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND ORIENTAL ARCHEOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES. I.*

Gabriel Oussani

To Biblical students the personality of Hammurabi is of more than ordinary interest, owing to the fact that he has been identified by the majority of Assyriologists and Biblical critics with Amraphel, King of Shin'ar, one of the four Mesopotamian Kings who, according to Genesis xiv, invaded Canaan, and were routed by Abraham and his 318 men in the vale of Siddim, near the Dead Sea.

* On the xivth ch. of Genesis, besides the commentaries of Tuch (1860), Knobel (2d ed. 1862), Delitzsch (Eng. tr. in 2 vols. Edinb.) 1888-1889, Dillmann (Eng. tr. in 2 vols. Edinb.) 1897, Holzinger (in the Nowack Series, 1898), Gunkel (in the Marti Series, 1901) and Driver (in the Westminster Series, 1904), the reader should refer to the Histories of the people of Israel by Ewald (1864-8), Hitzig (1862), Graetz (1853-76), Kohler (1875-93), Wellhausen (1878 and1894-7), Stade (1881-8), Renan (1887-93), Kittel (1888-92), Klostermann (1896), Sayce (1897), Marquart (1897), Piepenbring (1898), Kent (1896-1900), Cornill (1898), Guthe (1899, 2d ed. 1904), Winckler (1895-1900), H. P. Smith (in the International Theological Library, 1903), Wade (1903), etc. . . . as well as Maspero's great work (Eng. tr. in 3 vol., 1894-1900), and the Histories of Babylonia and Assyria by Hommel (1885), Tiele (1886-8), Kaulen (5 ed. 1899), Rogers (1900), Brunengo (1885), and Winckler (1892). Cf. besides, MacCurdy *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, New York, 1895-1900, in 3 vols. Paton, *The Early History of Syria and Palestine*, New York, 1901; Vigouroux *La Bible et les découvertes modernes en Palestine, Egypte et Assyrie*, (6th ed. 1896, Paris); Boscawen, *First of Empires*, London, 1903; Hommel *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, London, 1897; Schrader, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, (2d ed., 1883, Eng. tr., under the title *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, London, 1885-8, in 2 vols.); and the third entirely new, edition of the same work, by Zimmern and Winckler, 1903; Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1904; Ball, *Light From the East*, London, 1899; Sayce's numerous works and articles, mentioned below; Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia* (2d ed., 1904); Krahmer in Illgen's *Zeitschrift fur historische Theologie*, vii, 4, pp. 87-106; Tuch's classical article in the *Zeitschrift fur Deutsche Morgenlandische Gesellschaft*, I, pp. 161-194; Nöldeke in his *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testament*, 1869; Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques*, I, 247-263 (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, vol. xv, 161 ff); Driver, *Hebrew Authority* in Dr. Hoggarth's *Authority and Archeology, Sacred and Profane*, London, 1899; pp. 39-45; *Expository Times*, Oct., Dec., 1906; and his two articles in the *Guardian*, March 11, and April 8, 1896; Gray, *Expositor*, May, 1898; Hommel, *Expository Times*, Nov., 1896; Jastrow, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1900; Johns, *Expository Times*, Aug., 1899; Offord, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archœology*, xxi, p. 256; Peiser, B *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1897; iv.; Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, vol. i, part i; Wellhausen, *Literature Centralblatt*, 1898, col. 1692; King, L., *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, 3 vol., 1898-1900 (especially the Introduction); as well as the works on Hammurabi's time and reign mentioned below.

We read in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis: "It came to pass in the days of Amraphel, King of Shin'ar;[1] Arioch, King of Ellasar;[2]

[1]Shin'ar is in all probability the Hebrew name for both North and South Babylonia (Gen. x, 10; xi, 2; Jos. vii, 21; Isa. xi, 11; Zech. v, 11; Dan. i, 2). It is probably a dialectic variation or phonetic corruption of the Babylonian name *Shumer* or *Sumer*, denoting Southern Babylonia, while *Akkad* (Gen. x, 10), was the name for Northern Babyloma. In Gen. xiv we are told that Amraphel was king of Shinar; and in Gen. x, 10, Shinar is described as the district in which were situated the four great cities of Babylonia, namely, Babel, Erech, Accad and Calneh; consequently, it is doubtful whether the Shinar of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis was that part of Babylonia of which the city of Babel, or Babylon, was the capital, as this was in the northern division of the country; for if the Shinar of Scripture is the Shumer of the Babylonian monuments, Shinar would have been its southern half. Jensen, however, objects that Shumer stands for Southern Babylonia (cf. *Zeitschrift fur Keilinschriftforschung*, vol. ii, p. 419), although the majority of Assyriologists are in favor of their identity. At any rate, in the latest period of Hebrew literature Shinar denoted the whole plain of Northern and Southern Babylonia. Cf. Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, London, 1902, pp. 119, 134, and his article on "Shinar" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv, p. 503; Sayce *Patriarchal Palestine*, pp. 67-8. The identification of Shinar and Sumer, as well as the original form and meaning of the latter, are not very certain. Oppert erroneously derived the Hebrew term *Shinar* from שׁני, shene, "two," and נהר, nahar, "river," i. e., "the country of the two rivers," i. e., Mesopotamia; but the interchange of the hard guttural *ain* in Shin'ar with the soft guttural *he* in the word *nahar* is inadmissable. (Oppert, *Etudes Assyriennes*, p. 137; and *Expédition Scientifique en Mésopotamie*, tome i, p. 259, and tome ii, p. 89 and 98). In 1872 Dr. E. Schrader proposed to read the ideographic signs for the country as a noun of dual form, i. e., *sani-iri*, or, *sania-ira* (dual), which would mean the "country of the two cities," i.e., of Shumer and Akkad. (*Keilinschrift. und das Alt. Testament*, 1sted., p. 34), but in the light of modern researches these etymologies are of antiquarian interest rather than of scientific value. Comp., however, the English version of the second edition of Schrader's work *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, p. 103 ff. Dillmann seems to incline in favor of Halévy's suggestion (*Journal Asiatique* Série viii, vol. 12, p. 507 ff.), and reads שׁני ער "the two cities." *Commentary on Genesis*, ad locum. Comp. also Spurrell, *Notes on the Text of the Book of Genesis*, 2d ed., 1896, p. 109; and Abbé Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes en Palestine, en Egypte et en Assyrie*, 6th ed., vol. i, pp. 351-353.

[2]One of the chief cities of Southern Babylonia, together with Erech, Sirpurra and Nippur. In the Babylonian inscriptions it appears under the form of Larsa which, in later times, became one of the principle centres of sun-worship. Larsa is now represented by the mounds of Senkerch, in Lower Babylonia, on the eastern bank of the Euphrates and about midway between Erech (Warka) and Ur (Mugayyar; cf. Loftus, *Travels in Chaldaea and Susiana*, p. 244 ff; Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 223-4; Schrader, *Keilinschrift. und das A. Testament*, 2d ed., pp. 135-6; Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, p. 491-2; Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, 1897, pp. 69-70. The Biblical form of the name represents, according to Prof. Sayce, "al-Larsa," i. e., "the city of Larsa;" (*op. cit.*, p. 69, and Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, sub voce), or a confusion between the name of Larsa and the Babylonian *al-sarri*, i. e., "city of the king;" (*Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 165); The transposition of the consonants *r* and *s* in the Hebrew form of the name was easily explained by Lenormant (*La langue primitive de la Chaldée*, p. 377), and accepted

Chedorlaomer, King of Elam;[3] and Tid'al, King of Goiim,[4] that they made war with Bera, King of Sodom,[5] and with Birsha, King of Go-

by H. Rawlinson and George Smith. According to Halévy, however, the original form of *La-arsa* was *Ellaarsa* (*Recherches Bibliques*, p. 253).The Ellasar of Gen. xiv is not to be confused with that situated in the S. of Assyria to the N. of Babylonia, mentioned by Isaiah xxxvii, 12, and in II Kings xix, 12, which, according to G. Smith, was formerly called Tel-Kamri, or Humut, and afterwards rebuilt by Tiglathpileser II, and called by him Tel-Assur (Comp. *Zeitschrift fur Aegyptische Sprache*, 1869, p. 11. Dillmann, *Comm. on Genesis* (Eng. trans.), vol. ii, p. 63, and Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, p. 492.

[3]Elam is the name of a country and people situated to the E. of Babylonia, and N. E. of the Persian Gulf, the capital of which was Susa. The form of the name in Assyro-Babylonian is *Elama*, *Elamma* and *Elamtu*, which means "Highlands," a name which was also applied by the ancient Babylonians to the Amorite Highlands of Canaan. In Sumerian, the language of the pre-Semitic inhabitants of Babylonia, the country of Elam was called Numma or Nimma which has the same meaning. According to Gen. x, 22, Elam is said to have been the son of Shem, which is true only geographically, for, ethnographically and linguistically considered, the Elamites had nothing in common with the descendants of Shem.

[4]The word, as a common noun, means literally "nations," ἐθνῶν. No people with such a name, however, has as yet been found. According to Gesenius, followed by Nöldeke, the name is identical with the אֵי הַגּוֹיִם of Gen. x, 5. The rendering "king of nations" is evidently too indefinite and meaningless, for it gives no suitable sense without some further name to define it (Spurrell, *Notes on Genesis*, p. 147). Dillmann, followed by the majority of commentators, rightly argues that "it must be a proper name though the reading may be corrupt," (*Commentary on Genesis*, Eng. Trans., vol. ii, p. 37). According to H. Rawlinson's conjecture, which is now widely accepted, the Hebrew form of the word is a corruption of *Gutim*, the *Guti* of the Assyrian inscriptions, a powerful people dwelling E. of the little Zab in N. Mesopotamia. Lenormant understands by it the Semitic races of Northern Mesopotamia (cf. F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on Genesis*, Eng. Trans., vol. i, p. 399); while Prof. Sayce thinks that *Goiim* corresponds to the "*Umman-manda*" of the cuneiform inscriptions, which denotes the hordes of northen people, who have been conspicuous, from time to time, by their invasions and rebellions. They represented, he tells us, the Kurdish tribes on the northern frontier of Elam. (Cf. his Article on "Goiim" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii, p. 224, in which he refers to Dr. Pinches's paper on "Certain Inscriptions and Records referring to Babylonia and Elam," in the *Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, xxix, 45-81). Comp. also Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 233 ff., who suggests their identification with the קוֹעַ of Ezec, xxiii, 10; and E. Schrader *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, 1878, pp. 258, 271, 294, 451 and 473; Driver, *Commentary on Genesis*, 1904, p. 158; Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Records of Assy. and Bab.*, pp. 206-7; Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 167; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 208 and 318, where the author advances the hypothesis that the Goiim, or Goi, of Gen. xiv, probably ought to refer to the territory of Gaww, or Yemama, near Saba, in South Arabia.

[5]One of the five "cities of the Plain" destroyed by fire from heaven (Gen. xix, 24), the other four being Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim and Zoar, although the last mentioned, probably on account of its insignificance, is expressly said to have escaped ruin. Sodom was probably situated at the S. end of the Dead Sea, where is now Jebel Usdum, or Sadum; cf. Dillmann, *Comm. on Gen. ad locum*; E. Robinson,

morrah[6]; Shinab, King of Admah;[7] and Shemeber, King of Zeboiim,[8] and the King of Bela (the same is Zoar).[9] All these joined together in the vale of Siddim (the same is the Salt Sea).[10] Twelve years they

Researches in Palestine, etc., vol. ii, 187 ff; G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 505 ff; Blankenhorn in *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palaestina-Vereins*, vol. xix (1896) pp. 53 ff; F. Buhl, *Geographie des alten Palastina*, 1896, p. 271, 117, 274, and the articles on "Sodom" in Hastings' and Cheyne's Bible Dictionaries.

[6]Mentioned elsewhere in the Old and New Testament, but always in connection with Sodom. The root of the name, if same as that of the Arabic, would mean "a city overwhelmed with water." According to Dr. Hull the position of Gomorrah, along with that of Sodom and the other three cities, is now generally admitted to have been in the Arabah, or plain, which lies to the north and not to the south end (cf. sup.) of the Dead Sea, (article "Gomorrah" in Hastings' *D. B.*). Dr. Hull seems to base his opinion mainly on Canon Tristram's researches (*Land of Israel*, 2d ed., pp. 363-366), as well as on his own personal inspection of the localities. Comp. however, G. A. Smith, *Historical Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 506-508, where both opinions are ably discussed.

[7]Mentioned also in Gen. x, 19; Deut. xxix, 22; and Hosea xi, 8; but as yet not identified.

[8]Unknown and not yet identified. It is also mentioned in Gen. x, 19; Deut. xxix, 23, and Hosea xi, 8.

[9]The name of this fifth city of the *"Plain"* is explained in Gen. xix, 22, by a popular etymology as signifying "littleness" (Cf. sup.). The name Zoar is mentioned by Josephus, Eusebius, Ptolemy, and several Arabic geographers of the Middle Ages, as an important place or city lying at the south end of the Dead Sea. Cf. Driver's article in Hastings' *D. B.*; Tuch, *Commentary on Genesis*, 2d ed., p. 280 ff; Guy le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London, 1890, pp. 286-292; Knobel, *Genesis*, ad locum; E. Robinson, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 517-19; Wetzstein, in Delitzsch's *Comment. on Genesis*, p. 564 ff. (4th ed., 1872); Tristram, *Land of Moab*, p. 60 ff, etc. . . . Whether the city of Zoar, together with the other four cities of the Plain, was situated on the South or North side of the Dead Sea is not yet settled. The south side is accepted by Knobel, Delitzsch, Keil, Dillmann, Riehm, Socin, Buhl, G. A. Smith, Clermont-Ganneau, Driver, Blankenhorn and the majority of commentators; while Major Conder, Grove, Tristram, Hull and the other English members of the Palestine Exploration Fund argue in favor of the North. Cf. the very exhaustive article on the subject by Canon Driver, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, sub voce. The English rendering "cities of the Plain" stands for the Hebrew כִּכַּר; but Kikkar means *circle*, from the stem *karar*, which originally meant "to move around," hence "to repeat," to "advance and retreat." The term was applied to the Jordan Valley which is explicitly called כִּכַּר הַיַּרְדֵּן, i. e., "the Circle of Jordan" in Gen. xiii, 10, 11; and 2 K. vii, 46; II Chron. iv, 17. Elsewhere it is used alone, as in Gen. xiii, 12; xix, 17, 29; Deut. xxxiv; and II Sam. xviii, 23.

[10]In Gen. xiv, 3, the "Vale of Siddim" is identified with the Salt Sea, and in v. 10, the locality is described as being full of wells of bitumen. The Vale of Siddim is mentioned by this name only in this chapter, and its identification with the Dead Sea is rather hypothetical, for, as Canon Driver remarks, if the Vale of Siddim is to be identified with the *entire* Salt Sea, as the writer of Gen. xiv seems to indicate, then we have a geologically impossible theory, for the Dead Sea existed ages before the time of Abraham. Consequently, either the clause in ver. 36 is a late and incorrect gloss, or the reference (if the narrative is historical), is to the shallow southern part of the Dead Sea, where, in the time of Abraham, there may have been dry land. Cf. Driver's article on *"Siddim"* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

served Chedorlaomer, and in the thirteenth year they rebelled. And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, and the kings that were with him, and smote the Rephaim in Ashteroth-Karnaim,[11] and the Zuzim in Ham,[12] and the Emim in Shaveh-Kiriathaim,[13] and the

[11]Rephaim, or "sons of Repha'", i. e., "Giants;" so LXX and Peshitta. In our text it refers, undoubtedly, to an old race of giants reputed to have once inhabited the western and eastern Jordan-Land. Comp. Jos. xv, 8; II Sam. xxi, 16, 18, 20; Deut. iii, 11. As a noun, the word is of plural form and means *shades, ghosts*, etc., and is connected by Stade (*Geschichte Israels*, I, p. 420) with the root רפה "to *sink*" and "*relax*," hence "*extinct*," "*sunken*," "*powerless*," etc. (Cf. Driver's *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 37), or "*shadowy*," "*vaguely known*," etc., according to Schwally (*Zeitschrift fur alttest. Wissenschaft*, xviii (1898) p. 127 ff, and Stade, *op. cit., loc. cit.*). Og, King of Bashan, is described in Jos. xii, 4; xiii, 12, as "of the remnant of the Rephaim." In the Wisdom Literature of the O. T. the name Rephaim is applied to the dead in Sheol (presumably as being "*sunken*," and "*extinct*"). Ashteroth-karnaim, or, simply, Ashteroth, as in Deut. i, 4; Jos. xxi, 27, was one of the principal cities of Bashan, identified with the modern Tel-'Ashtera, two and a half hours' journey from Nawa, and 21 miles E. of the Sea of Galilee, or Muzeirile, 8 miles further S. Cf. Dillmann, *Gen.*, p. 238; Spurrell, *Notes on Genesis*, 148; Driver's art. on "Ashteroth," in Hastings' *D. B.*; Bull, *Geographie d. Alten Palaestina*, 248 ff; G. A. Smith in Cheyne's *Encyclopœdia Biblica*, col. 335 ff. Wetzste n prefers to identify it with Bosra, the capital of Hauran. Comp., however, Nöldeke's refutation of this opinion in *Zeitschrift fur Deutsche Morgenlandische Gesellschaft*, vol. xxix, p. 431. The LXX, Codex Vaticanus, reads Ἀσταρὼθ καὶ καρναιν, and Kuenen thinks it possible that this is the true reading. Cf. Rob. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 310; Dillmann's *Gen.* ad loc., Buhl in *Z. D. P. V.*, vol. xiii, 42 ff. The name means "the two-horned Ashteroth" who, as the goddess of the moon, was represented with two horns. It is probable, however, that the form Ashteroth-Karnaim means simply "Ashtoreth near, or which is near Karnaim."

[12]Probably, as first suggested by Gesenius, the same as the Zamzummim of Deut. ii, 20, 21, who are supposed to have preceded the Ammonites in the occupation of the N. E. region of the Dead Sea. Cf. Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik d. A. Testament*, p. 162; Dillmann, *op. cit.*, and Delitzsch, Driver, etc., ad loc., and the latter's *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, in the "International Critical Commentary," p. 40. The phonetic difference between the two forms, i. e., Zuzim and Zamzummim, has been ingeniously explained by Prof. Sayce on the ground of a supposedly Babylonian version of the story. (Cf. *Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 106 f, and *Expository Times*, viii, 463). In Babylonian *m* and *w* are represented by the same phonetic character. Hence, according to Sayce, in Deut, ii, 20, the name appears as it was actually *pronounced*—or, at least, nearly so (i. e., Zuzim for Za WZeWim), while in Gen. xiv, 5, it appears as it was written by a scribe who was translating from a Babylonian document (i. e., ZaMZeMim), and did not know what the true pronunciation was. But, as Dr. Driver remarks, before this theory can be accepted, better proof is needed than has hitherto been advanced that Gen. xiv was really translated from a Babylonian original; the strongly Hebraic style and coloring of the chapter do not favor the supposition (article "Zuzim," in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv, p. 994. A locality with the name of Ziza, lying between Bosra and Lijun and mentioned by several Arabic geographers of the Middle Ages, such as Ibn Battuta and Abulfeda, has been favorably identified with the Biblical locality (Cf. Tristram, *The Land of Moab*, p. 182 ff). Ham was probably the capital of that little kingdom.

[13]"Emim" means in Hebrew "terrors," or "the terrible ones." According

Horites in their mount Seir, unto el-Paran, which is by the wilderness.[14] And they returned, and came to En-Misphat (the same is Kadesh),[15] and smote all the country of the Amalekites, and also the

---

to Deut. ii, 10 ff, the Emim were a giant people who once inhabited the territory E. of the Dead Sea, in the S. half of the territory between Bashan and Seir, afterwards occupied by the Moabites. The Emim, we are told, were called so by their conquerors, the Moabites, on account of their gigantic size and strength, being "as tall as the anakim." Shaveh-Kiriathaim, or "the plain of Kiriathaim," was situated about 10 miles N. of the Arnon, and 10 miles E. of the Dead Sea. In Num. xxxii, 37, and Jos. xiii, 19, the town "Kiriathaim" is mentioned as belonging to the Reubenites; in Jer. xlviii, 23, and Ezek. xxv, 9, as belonging to the Moabites. According to the *Onomasticon*, it was situated about 10 Roman miles (or four hours journey) southwest of Mêdeba. The ruins, called at the present day Kareyat, have been identified by Seetzen, Burkhardt, Baedeker, (Socin) and Dillmann, with this Biblical locality. Cf. also G. A. Smith, *Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 567 ff; Buhl, *Geogryphie*, p. 267; Tristram, *Land of Moab*, p. 275, 305. The dual form of the name may suggest the idea that it comprised two cities, i. e., "*double-town.*" On the famous Moabite stone, line 10, (8-9th century B. C.), the place is mentioned under the form of *Kiriathen.*

[14]The Horites are supposed to have been the original inhabitants of Edom in the land of Seir, i. e., in the hill country between the Dead Sea and the Aelanitic Gulf. According to Deut. ii, 12, 22, Yahweh destroyed them before the sons of Esau (i. e., the Edomites) and gave the latter their country. Nowhere in the O. T. are the Horites said to be *rephaim* or "giants," as it is said of the Emim and the Zamzummim, although, in all probability, they were; for their name would mean "cave-dwellers" or "Troglodytes" from the Hebrew חור *hole*, Arab. *hawr, cave.* Cf. Driver's *Deuteronomy*, p. 38; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 263; W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 136, 155, 156. According to Sayce (*High. Crit. and the Monuments*, p. 204); "it is better to connect it with a root which signifies 'white,'" and to see in them the representatives of a white race whom their neighbors contrasted with the red-skinned Edomites. In this case they would have been members of the Amorite stock (cf. Sayce's article on the "White Race of Ancient Palestine," in the *Expositor*, July, 1888.

[15]'En-mispath means, literally, "Well of judgment," i. e., a place where there was a sacred well and where oracular decisions were given to litigants and others. It was, in all probability, the seat of a temple or oracle, as it appears from its second name *Kadesh*, i. e., "sacred "place. Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 1st ed. p. 165, 2d ed, p. 181 and Père Lagrange, *Religions Sémitiques*, 2d ed., p. 265. In the history of Moses the place is often called "Kadesh Barnea," concerning which Colonel Conder remarks "with the exception of Sinai, no spot is more memorable in the history of the wanderings of the Israelites." No plausible identification has as yet been made of the location of Kadesh-Barnea. Those of Robinson and Wetzstein are highly probable, while that of Prof. E. H. Palmer, who identifies it with the modern 'Ain Qadis, on the western slope of the 'Azazimeh Plateau, south of Elusa, four and a half hours east-south-east of the well of Hagar and about 50 miles S. of Beersheba, is more acceptable. Cf. Conder in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, sub voce; and especially Trumbull's *Kadesh-Barnea*, 1881, pp. 238-321. On the modern 'Ain Kadish cf. *The Biblical World*, (Chicago), May, 1901, p. 327 ff, with photographs and plan.

Amorites, that dwelt in Hazazon-Tamar.[16] And there went out the King of Sodom, and the King of Gomorrah, and the King of Admah, and the King of Zeboiim, and the King of Bela, and they set the battle in array against them in the vale of Siddim . . . four kings against the five. Now the vale of Siddim was full of slime pits; and the Kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, and they fell there, and they that remained fled to the mountains. And they took all the goods of Sodom and Gomorrah, and all their victuals, and went their way. And they took Lot, Abraham's brother's son, who dwelt in Sodom, and his goods, and departed. And there came one that had escaped, and told Abraham the Hebrew; now he dwelt by the oaks of Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol, and brother of Aner, and these were confederate with Abraham. And when Abraham heard that his brother was taken captive, he led forth his trained men, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued as far as Dan. And he divided himself against them by night, he and his servants, and smote them, and pursued them unto Hobab, which is on the left hand of Damascus. And he brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot, and his goods, and the women also, and the people. . . . [17] (Next follows the well-known episode of Abraham's meeting with Melchizedek, King of Salem or Jerusalem, etc. . . .)

The above narrative has been, for the last half century, and especially since 1869, the battle-field of two diametrically opposing schools of critics and exegetes, the one holding to its historical accuracy, the other contending that it is a fabrication of more or less legendary character, intended to glorify Abraham as warrior and conqueror. In 1854 Grotefend, one of the pioneers of Assyro-Babylonian research and a man of exceptional erudition,[18] in a fanciful article, published

[16]In II Chron. xx, 2, Hazazon Tamar is identified with 'En-gedi, (modern name 'ain-jidi, "the well of the kid"), on the west side of the Dead Sea, noted for its palm trees, as the name itself indicates "(Palm-rows," or "cutting of palms"), Cf. E. Robinson's *Bibl. Researches*, i, 500-509; Baedeker-Socin's *Palestine*, p. 143, 2d ed., p. 175; G. A. Smith, *Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 269 ff; Tristram, *Land of Moab*, p. 280 ff; Conder, *Bible Places*, London, 1897, pp. 8 and 113; and Delitzsch, Dillmann, Driver, Spurrell, etc., ad locum. Knobel and Holzinger prefer to identify it with *Thamara* (The Tamar of Ez. xlvii, 19; xlviii, 28), at present represented by Kurnub, about 20 miles W.S.W. of the S. end of the Dead Sea. But this view is refuted by Cheyne (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 1977). Cf. also Driver's *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 161-2.

[17]Genesis xiv, 1-18.

[18]On George Frederik Grotefend (1775-1853), and his work cf. Scholz, *Die Keilschrift-Urkunden*, Wurzburg, 1877, p. 12 ff; Ménant, *Les Ecritures Cuneiforms*, p. 55; Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes en Egypte, Assyrie et Palestine*,

in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*,[19] advanced the theory that the fourteenth chapter of Genesis was an old Babylonian myth: Chedorlaomer was the Autumn; Amraphel, the Spring; Arioch, the Summer, and Tidal, the Winter. He based his theory on fantastic etymological interpretations of the names, which had no basis in any Semitic language known to him. Chedorlaomer means, according to him, a band for the sheaf, which would indicate the harvest season and consequently the Autumn; Amraphel was formed from the word *'emer*, "lamb" (Cf. Esd., vii, 17), and *pel-pul*, "great," and, consequently, one of the signs of the Zodiac; Arioch represents the "lion," another sign of the Zodiac; and Tidal, from tida, "*experience*," and '*al-*"*to enter*," or "the setting of the sun," (cf. Dan., vi, 15), and consequently the Winter. The five Canaanitish kings, routed by the four west-Asiatic despots, represent the five complementary days which were added by the Babylonian calendar to the three hundred and sixty days to form the twelve months of the year (represented in our narrative by the twelve years of the Babylonian supremacy over the five defeated rulers.)[20]

Von Bohlen thought to find in Amraphel, the legendary King Sardanapalus; in Arioch, Arbace and in Chedorlaomer, Belesis.[21] According to Hitzig, the campaign of the four Mesopotamian kings was an imitation of the campaign of Sennacherib, King of Assyria,

---

6th ed., 1896, vol. i, p. 139 ff; R. W. Rogers, *History of Assyria and Babylonia*, New York, 1901, vol. i, p. 46 ff, and p. 175 ff; Hommel's *History of Babylonia* and *Assyria*, (Italian version) p. 130; Kaulen's *Assyrien und Babylonien*, etc., Freiburg, 1891, p. 47; Hilprecht, H., *Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th century*, Philadelphia, 1903, pp. 23-24 and 187; and the article on "Grotefend," in Vigouroux's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*; and *Beitrage zur Assyriologie*, tom. I. Leipzig, 1890, pp. 80-93.

[19]*Zur altesten Sagenpoesie des Orients*, II. "*Der erste Krieg auf Erden, eine Dichtung aus spatere Zeit*," in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*, tome viii, p. 800 ff.

[20]Comp. Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes*, 6th ed., vol. i, p. 503, and *Les Livres Saints et la Critique Rationaliste*, 4th ed., vol. iv, p. 299.

[21]"As to the question whether there is any historical reality as a foundation for our narrative, after having carefully examined the circumstances of the event, we affirm categorically to the contrary. In fact, it is not credible that four powerful Asiatic monarchs would seriously think of gathering their collective forces to march against a rebellious district of only few miles of territory. The whole of Palestine, in fact, would hardly compensate for the trouble and the expense of such a war, and a subordinate satrap with a small army would have been able easily to bring the rebels into submission. Furthermore, the mention of Sennaar, Ellassar and Elam, shows that we have here a political condition several centuries later than the period to which the events narrated are attributed. . . . All this brings the events historically down to the time of Sardanapalus." *Die Genesis*, Koenigsberg, 1835, p. 168-170.

against Judah (701 B. C.) which took place several centuries later. Hitzig thinks that the simple fact that both campaigns took place in the "fourteenth year" suffices in itself to justify his assertion.[22] F. Finzi, the first and almost the only Italian Assyriologist, in his clever, although now antiquated book, entitled *Ricerche per lo studio dell' antichita assira*, maintains the views advanced by Grotefend.[23] Knobel holds that, although the basis of the narrative may be historical, the whole story is considerably intermingled with legendary and unhistorical details. It was impossible, according to him, that the Elamite rule, represented in Genesis xiv by Chedorlaomer, could have extended its dominion as far as Canaan at such an early date as that of Abraham.[24]

All these attacks, however, were superseded by that of the greatest living Semitic scholar, Th. Nöldeke, of Strasburg, who, in 1869, published his masterly treatise *On the Unhistorical Character of the Fourteenth Chapter of Genesis*,[25] in which he made the attempt to show that criticism has for ever disproved its claim to be historical; that the political situation presupposed by it was impossible; that the names of the several kings there mentioned were etymological inventions; that many of the geographical names were cabalistic in form; that a Babylonian conquest of Canaan at such an early period was hardly credible; and that even the number of Abraham's men, 318, was artificial, for it represents the numerical value of the Hebrew letters of the name of Eliezer, Abraham's chief of staff and adviser (Gen. xv, 2,) which are אליעזר i. e., 1 plus 30 plus 10 plus 70 plus 7 plus 200 equal 318. Nöldeke's views, as a whole, are still holding their ground, at least to a certain extent, with the majority of modern critics, notwithstanding the greatly modified situation caused by the discovery and deciphering of several Babylonian monuments and inscriptions.

Edward Reuss, in 1879, wrote that "Our narrative cannot be as old as it is supposed to be. This story does not bear the

[22] F. Hitzig, *Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, Leipzig, 1869, vol. i, p. 45.

[23] Published in Torino, 1872, p. 204 ff. Cf. Brunengo, S. J. *L' Impero di Babilonia e di Ninive*, etc. Prato, 1885, vol. i, p. 262.

[24] *Die Genesis*, Leipzig, 1860, p. 152.

[25] "Die Ungeschichtlichkeit der Erzählung Gen. xiv," in his *Untersuchung zur kritik des Alten Testaments*, Kiel, 1869, pp. 156-172; and *Jahrbücher für Wissenchaftliche Theologie*, (1870), pp. 213 ff. "The arguments can be easily multiplied to show that our narrative has no historical value whatever," *op. cit.*, p. 168; "The whole campaign to the east and west of the Jordan is improbable; a positive sign that it is a fiction," *ibid*, p. 163.

mark of great antiquity; it is not based on any account or document which can be said to refer to contemporary testimony. All this is so certain that the fact of the campaign itself becomes suspect."[26] Sorensen thinks that the fourteenth chapter of Genesis originally referred to the campaign of Antigonus against the Nabatæans, which took place in the year 307 B. C.[27] Kuenen says that our chapter is "of very recent date, however archaic it may be in form. The names ברע and ברשע (v. 2) are symbolical. Mamre and Eshkol, and presumably Aner also (v. 13, 24), are transformed from places into men. Verses 5 and 6, relating to the previous inhabitants of the Transjordanic district, appear to have been adopted from Deut. ii, 10-12, 20. Verses 18-20 are intended to glorify the priesthood of Jerusalem and to justify their claiming titles";[28] and as to its historical value he adopts unreservedly the opinion of Nöldeke and Ed. Meyer. According to Wellhausen the whole chapter is simply a very late interpolation. "That at the time of Abraham four kings from the Persian Gulf made a razzia (or raid) as far as the peninsula of Sinai; that they, on that occasion, surprised and captured five city princes who reigned in the Dead Sea; that finally Abraham, at the head of three hundred and eighteen servants, fell upon the departing victors, and recaptured what they had robbed,—these are simply impossibilities."[29] The same distinguished critic speaks of faith in the historicity of our narrative as having received its "deathblow" from Nöldeke, and pronounces the latter's criticism to be "unshaken and unanswerable."[30] Kautzsch says that "the remarkable chapter, Genesis xiv, seems to be taken from a Midrash on the Patriarchal History and is probably one of the additions due to the final redactor."[31] Maspero, admitting a probably historical kernel to the narrative, adds that "La tradition hébraique s'empara de ce fait et y mêla assez maladroitement l'un des chefs mythiques de la race juive," i. e., the glorification of Abraham as

---

[26] *L'histoire sainte et la loi*, vol. i, p. 347-348.

[27] Cf. Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, p. 172; and Vigouroux, *Les livres Saints et la critique rationaliste*, vol. iv, p. 307.

[28] *Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, London, 1886, p. 324 and 143; and the same author's *Onderzoek*, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 314, as well as Stade, *Geschichte Israels*, and especially his article in the *Zeitschrift für Alttesttamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. vi. p. 323 ff.

[29] *Die Composition des Hexateuch* (3d ed.) Berlin, 1899, p. 312.

[30] *Op. cit.*, pp. 311-312; and *Geschichte Israels*, 1878, p. 362.

[31] *An Outline of the History of the Literature of the Old Testament*, London, 1899, p. 119, note.

warrior and conqueror.[32] According to Winckler the story that Abraham with 318 servants slew his enemies may go back to a moon-myth, the moon being visible 318 days in the year,[33] and we know that according to the same scholar and others like Goldziher and Stucken, the whole patriarchal history resolves itself into astral myths.[34] Cheyne says that there is at least sufficient reason "for urging at any rate suspense of judgment relative to the historical character of the Chedorlaomer episode, and for hesitating to follow M. Loisy, when he says that "in spite of some critics, this episode is a sufficiently good certificate of personal existence for the Father of the Faithful" (Etudes Bibliques, 3d ed., Paris, 1903. p. 176).[35] Cheyne's own view is that "This unique narrative, so flattering to the pride of the later Jews, is evdiently a fragment of a post-exilic mid-rash on the life of Abraham."[36] The same negative view is held by E. Meyer,[37] Cornell,[38] Holzinger,[39] and others. Renan characterizes the Chedorlaomer-Abraham narrative as one of those "numerous episodes of the charming pastoral epopoea which was afterwards built upon this golden age which had little that was historical about it";[40] and, although, he explicitly affirms that the narrative in question "is the only fragment in these legends which *has the appearance* of being taken from authentic ancient books," (p. 97), nevertheless he adds that "It is dangerous to look too closely after history in ancient dreams, where spectres are indistinguishable from men."[41]

---

[32] *Histoire Ancienne des peuples de l'Orient*, 6th ed. p. 188.

[33] Apud Gunkel *The Legends of Genesis*, (Eng. trans.), Chicago, 1901, p. 120.

[34] *Abraham als Babylonier, Joseph als Egypter*, Leipzig, 1903; *Mythology Among the Hebrews*, (Eng. trans. by J. Martineau), London; and *Geschichte Israels in Einzel-darstellungen*, 1897-1900; E. Stucken, *Astralmythen der Hebraer, Babylonier und Egypter*, Leipzig, 1896-1902, and *Beitrage zur Orientalischen Mythologie* in the Berlin *Mitteilungen* of the German Oriental Society, 1902. Comp. the interesting article of M. E. Cosquin "Fantaisies biblico-Mythologiques d'un chef d'école." in the *Revue Biblique*, Janvier, 1905, pp. 3-58.

[35] *Bible Problems and the New Material for their Solution*. (Crown Theological Library), New York, 1904, p. 261, and also 146-150.

[36] Art. "Abraham" in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, col. 25. Comp. also the same author's "Hibbert Lectures" on the *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, London, 1889, p. 42.

[37] *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. i, p. 165 ff.

[38] *Einleitung in den Alten Testament*, p. 72 ff; although in his *History of the People of Israel*, (Eng. trans.) p. 34, he vaguely admits that the tradition which represents Abraham as a religious leader and hero is probably historical.

[39] *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, 1893, vol. i, p. 424 ff.

[40] *History of the People of Israel* (Eng. trans.) vol. i, p. 96.

[41] *Op. cit.*, p. 98.

H. P. Smith, one of the latest historians of Israel, writes that in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis "to our surprise, Abraham appears as a general. He has a body of trained slaves which enables him to defeat an army of regulars. The inconsistency of the picture with what we find elsewhere is plain enough. Where was this valiant band of retrainers when Sarah was taken into the harem of Pharaoh? The doubt suggested by the discordance in the accounts is confirmed by closer examination of the narrative of victory itself. The route of Chedorlaomer is unintelligible if his objective point was the cities of the Plain. The mustering of four Mesopotamian kings against the five towns was ludicrously out of proportion. The victory of Abraham, the complete recovery of the spoil, and the lack of any attempt on the part of Chedorlaomer to re-establish himself, are alike inconceivable. We are compelled, therefore, to leave this section out of our calculation. Its discordance with the general picture is too pronounced to allow us to regard it as historical."[42]

Finally, Mr. Chilperic Edwards, in his recent book on the "Hammurabi Code and the Sinaitic Legislation,"[43] tells us that "the earlier school of Assyriologists were led into many errors through paying too much regard to the fables of classical writers, such as Ctesias and Herodotus. But though these authors have long been given up as misleading, the *ignis fatnus* of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis still flickers over the field of Assyriology. If it were not for Genesis xiv, many commonly-made assertions would never have been invented, and Babylonian history would have been more sober and less imaginative. It is difficult to understand why this chapter should have had such a hypnotising effect, for its fictitious nature is its most obvious characteristic. The well-known Orientalist, Professor Nöldeke, demonstrated its unhistorical nature half a century ago, and his conclusions have never been refuted. In fact, it is somewhat a slur on one's intelligence to have it presented as possessing any historical value whatever."[44]

[42]*Old Testament History*, in the *International Theological Library*, New York, 1903, p. 37. In the notes to the above quotation the author adds that "the archaic allusion to Raphaim and Luzim (Gen. xiv, 5-7) and other long-perished nations seems to be based on the notice in Deut. ii. The route around the Dead Sea, into the desert and back, is impracticable for an army," and the desperate attempts that have been made of late years to secure the historicity of this chapter, on the ground of Babyloman literature, are futile, for "all that seems to be established is that the author of our section knew by tradition of early Elamite supremacy in Western Asia."

[43]Issued by the "Rationalist Press Association," London, 904.

[44]*Op. cit.*, pp. 151-152.

Aside from what is arbitrary and untenable in Nöldeke's theory and that of the majority of advanced critics, it cannot be asserted that their attacks, as a whole, are altogether prejudiced and sophistical. They have undoubtedly showed that in many of the details the narrative as it now stands, must have undergone the subtle touch of some post-exilic writer who was at the same time a scholar, historian, and romancer. Many of the geographical and ethnographical names so profusely scattered through the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, seem to be too artificial and cabalistic to admit a strict historical foundation.[45] The Jewish doctors themselves seem to have felt the difficulty, as their interpretation of many of the proper names amply shows.[46]

The names of the four Mesopotamian kings and their kingdoms are certainly historical, although somewhat transfigured. The four names of the kings of the five cities of the Plain (the name of the fifth not being mentioned), are rather problematic. The names Bera, Birsha, Shinab, and Shemeber mean, according to Hitzig, "blasphemer," "rogue," "serpent's tooth," and "scorpion's poison," respectively, but as Delitzsch remarks, "this has only the value of a poor witticism" (*Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i, p. 399). The Jewish doctors have already pointed out that the names בֶּרַע Bera, and בִּרְשַׁע Birsha, are composed from בֶּן־רַע benra, literally "the son of evil," and בֶּן־רִשְׁע, ben-resha, "the son of wickedness." Shemeber, the name of the fourth king, appears in the Samaritan Pentateuch, as שְׁמְאֵבֶר, i. e., "the name is lost." Halévy (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, vol. x, 1885, p. 3,) thinks that the names Bera' and Birsha' are composed from אֲבִי־רַע and אֲבִי־רִשַׁע. But the Septuagint has *Βαλλα* for בֶּרַע and *Σεναρ* (Samaritan שִׁנְאָר) for שִׁנְאָב, and pronounces שְׁמְאֵבֶר *Συμοβορ*. Gesenius (*Thesaurus*), and Hitzig (*Geschichte Israels*, p. 25), think the names of Sodom and Gomorrah are artificial, and that they simply mean "*submerged*," "*overwhelmed*," "*destroyed*," "*swallowed by the earth*," etc., being a description of their fate. But, as Dillmann remarks, "when the tradition (of the form of the names) is so uncertain, an interpretation of the names from Hebrew roots is, to say the least, a doubtful proceeding. (*Commentary on Genesis*, vol. ii, p. 39). It has also been pointed out that in verse 1, the four kings are named in alphabetical order, which betrays, according to some, a cabalistic elaboration, for, although the leader of the campaign is undoubtedly Kedorlaomer, his name is postponed for the sake of

[45]Cf. Nöldeke, *op. cit.*

[46]Cf. Jerusalem Talmud, Bereshith Rabba.

literary artifice. The scene in the story is laid in the Vale of *Siddim*. But according to Nöldeke and others, this should most probably be read *Shedim* (the difference in Hebrew is merely a dot on the consonant ש)—i. e., "demons," as in Deut. xxxii, 17, and Psalms cvi, 37. The foes smitten by Chedorlaomer are, consequently, of a suspiciously eschatological character (Cf. Chilperic Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 152-3). "The names Rephaim, Emim, and Zamzummim are," as Canon Driver remarks, "all somewhat curious, and provoke speculation as to their possible origin and significance. Rephaim is also the Hebrew (cf. Isa. xiv, 9; Ps. lxxxviii, 10, etc.), and Phoenician (cf. *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, I. i, 38), name for the "*shades*, or *ghosts*" of the dead; אימה (whence Emim) is a Hebrew word meaning *terror*. The Arabic *zamzamah* is a "*distant, confused sound*," *zizim* is the *low* or *faint sound of the Jinn*, heard by night in the desert (Lane, *Arabic Lexicon*, col. 1248-1249). Prof. W. R. Smith writes (MS. note): "Antioch and the country about it also claimed to have been inhabited of old by giants (Malalas, ed. Bonn, p. 202), The giant-legends no doubt arose in part from the contemplation of ancient ruins of great works and supposed gigantic tombs; but I think that Schwally, (*Das Leben nach dem Tode*, 1892, p. 64 f), is not wrong in supposing a connection between רפאים "*ghosts*," and רפאים "*extinct giants*," and also in connecting אימים with אימה "*terror*." So again Zamzummim mean doubtless, he says, "*whisperers*," "*murmurers*;" and the name might have been illustrated by him from the Arabic *azif*, the eerie sound of the Jinn in the wilderness (Wellhausen, *Reste Arabische Heidentumes*, p. 136). I take it that the old giants were still thought to haunt the ruins and deserts of East Canaan." (Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 40-41). Ed. Meyer (*Geschichte* § 136), explicitly asserts that the supposed tribes of the Rephaites, Zuzim and Emim never existed. As to the Horites we have seen that the name means *cave-dwellers* or *troglodytes*, from חור "*hole*," Arabic, *haur*, "*cave*," and as the sepulchres of Palestine are almost universally rock-hewn tombs, the Horites, or "cave-dwellers," would be the dead lying in such receptacles. Jerome, in fact, attests that the habit of living in caves was prevalent in Edom in his days. (Cf. art. "*Edomites*," in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and Driver's *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 38). To this must be added the fact, mentioned above, that the forces led by Abraham, "three hundred and eighteen," are, curiously enough, the numerical equivalent of the Hebrew letters of the name of Abraham's chief servant, Eliezer. Other historical,

chronological and geographical difficulties to be met with in the study of Gen. xiv will be further discussed below.

The opposing school is headed by two distinguished Oriental scholars and archaeologists, Prof. H. Sayce, of Oxford,[47] and Prof. Fritz Hommel, of Munich.[48] Their followers are quite important in numbers. They consist mainly of the Conservative school of Catholic and Protestant theology and apologetics, such as Brunengo, S. J.,[49] and De Cara, S. J.,[50] in Italy; Vigouroux,[51] Abbé de Moore,[52] and many others[53] in France; Lamy,[54] de Harlez,[55] Brucker,[56] Delattre,

[47]In his numerous books and articles, such as *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, London, 5th ed., 1894; *Patriarchal Palestine*, London, 1895; *The Early History of the Hebrews*, New York, 1897; *Early Israel and the Surrounding Nations*, London, 1899; *The Egypt of the Hebrews and Herodotus*, London, 2d ed., 1895; *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, London, 1888; *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*, New York, 1904. Also his very numerous articles and contributions in the *Proceedings*, as well as *Transactions*, of the Society of Biblical Archeology of London; the *Expository Times*; the *Homiletic Review*, New York; the *Sunday School Times*, of Philadelphia; the *Biblical World*, of Chicago, and other theological Reviews of England and America, where his views and conclusions are often quoted and relied upon as a trustworthy source of information by both preachers and laymen.

[48]*The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments: A Protest against the Modern School of Old Testament Criticism*, London, 1897; and his many articles contributed to the *Expository Times*, and the Philadelphia *Sunday School Times*.

[49]*L'Impero di Babilonia e di Ninive secondo i Monumenti Cuneiformi comparati colla Bibbia*, Prato, 1885, in two vols. (originally published in form of articles in the *Civilta Cattolica* of the Jesuit Fathers, in Rome (1878-1884). This was the first and is still the only work in Italian on the subject, except the Italian version of Hommel's *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, by Diego Valbuse, Milano, 1895.

[50]In several articles and reviews in the *Civilta Cattolica*, as well as in his very interesting *Esame critico del sistema filologico e linguistico applicato alla mitologia ed allo studio delle Religioni*, Rome, 1889.

[51]*La Bible et les découvertes modernes en Palestine, Eygpte et Assyrie*, 1st ed., Paris, 1877, in 4 vols. (translated into German by Joh. Ibach, of Villmar), 6th ed., Paris, 1896 cf. especially vol. i, pp. 481-504; *Les Livres Saints et la critique rationaliste*, New ed., Paris, 1900. (Translated into Italian and Spanish), and his great *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, of which 28 parts have already appeared, on which cf. the NEW YORK REVIEW, vol. i, N. I, p. 113.These and other works of the well-known Sulpician scholar have always been considered as the standard authority on the subject by the Catholic clergy of France, Italy and Spain. They represent, in fact, an immense amount of erudition and are ultra-conservative in tone.

[52]In several important articles and studies contributed mainly to *La Science Catholique*, of Arras.

[53]Abbé Pelt, Prat, S. J., Lestêre, Legendre, Ermoni, Card. Meignan, de Broglie, etc., and especially Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques*, vol. i, pp. 330-364.

[54]*Introductio in Sacram Scripturam*, and especially, his *Commentaire sur la Genèse*, and his articles in the *Science Catholique* and *Le Prêtre*, of Arras.

[55]In the well-known periodical *Le Muséon*, of Louvain, founded by him in 1885.

[56]*Questions Actuelles d'Ecriture Sainte*, Paris, 1898. and in many articles in the *Etudes Religieuses*.

S. J.,[57] in Belgium; Bissell,[58] Green,[59] and others in America.[60]

Prof. Sayce, with his usual method of biblio-archaeological criticism, contends that "the historical character of Chedorlaomer's campaign has been amply vindicated by the monuments";[61] that its strictly historical character "has been verified in a very complete manner even to the forms of the proper names which have been handed down in the Hebrew MSS. with remarkably little corruption;"[62] that the points in which the narrative in Genesis have been verified and illustrated by Assyriological research are "more than sufficient to prove its historical character, and to indicate that it has been derived from a Babylonian source."[63] Prof. Hommel goes still further, for he even tells us of the original source from which Genesis xiv was derived. "The balance of probability", he says, "inclines in favor of a Cuneiform original. An original, moreover, dating not from the post-exilic period but from Jerusalem, in or soon after the time of Abraham, a Hebrew translation of which must have been incorporated into the main stock of the Pentateuch at a very early date,"[64] that "for the rest, the very fact that the text has fallen into confusion from verse 17 onwards—taken in conjunction with the presence of so many obscure and archaic expressions, which it was necessary to explain to later generations by means of glosses—is the best possible proof of the very high antiquity of this whole chapter. Probably the original, which seems to have been written in Babylonian (sic!), was rescued from the archives of the pre-Israelitish Kings of Salem, and preserved in the archives of the temple of Jerusalem."[65] Prof. Sayce, of course, fully indorses Hommel's views by declaring that "it must have come from the original chronicles of Babylonia, from one of those historical works, in fact, which we know to have been current in Babylonia, which would have formed part of the literature

[57] In several articles in various Reviews, and especially in his latest work *La Question Biblique*, Liège, 1904.

[58] *The Pentateuch, Its Origin and Structure*, New York, 1885, and *Historical Origin of the Books of the Old Testament*, New York, 1894.

[59] *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, New York, 1895.

[60] Among the latest champions of the Sayce-Hommel school, is Dr. Emil Reich, who has suddenly become famous through his lectures *On the Bankruptcy of the Higher Criticism*, which first appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, and later in book form, New York-London, 1905.

[61] *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 171.

[62] *Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*, in the *Homiletic Review*, 1897, p. 205.

[63] *Higher Criticism*, etc., p. 157.

[64] *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 191.

[65] *Op. cit.*, p. 151-152.

studied in the schools and stored in the libraries of Canaan in the age of Babylonia supremacy and influence."[66]

Prof. Hommel's statements regarding Gen. xiv have been aptly characterized by Dr. Bevan as a "fairy palace of conjecture, built upon the slenderest foundation";[67] and this criticism equally applies to Prof. Sayce's utterances which are an excellent specimen of arbitrary solution of archaeological problems.[68]

The truth is that both these extreme schools are to be mistrusted, and their conclusions, at least in part, rejected. That Nöldeke's theory has been substantially contradicted by the monuments no one can deny. That Sayce and Hommel's dogmatic utterances on the other side are greatly exaggerated can hardly be questioned. It is almost preposterous to deny the historical character of the main body of the narrative, and still more so to deny the historical existence of the Father of the Faithful;[69] but it must be remembered that neither the personal existence of Abraham, nor the historical character of the events attributed to him or to the four Mesopotamian kings can claim to have been vindicated by the archaeological discoveries. "Monumental evidence that the narrative is historical is at present entirely lacking. The terms in which Prof. Sayce and others have spoken of it are altogether unwarranted by the facts. It is not difficult to sum up what the monuments have taught us respecting Gen. xiv. Of the four kings mentioned in v. 1, who were previously but mere names, they have, we may reasonably hold, brought two, Amraphel and Arioch, into the light of history, and have told us many interesting particulars about them. In three *late* inscriptions (3rd cent. B. C.), mention is also made of a king who is *perhaps* identified with Chedorlaomer, and *possibly* of Tid'al as well: the 'Eri-ekua' of these inscriptions *may* also be the 'Eriaku of Larsa' of the older inscriptions (i. e., the Arioch of Gen. xiv). The older inscriptions show that Amraphel

---

[66] *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*, p. 63.

[67] *Critical Review*, 1897, vol. vii, p. 410-11.

[68] On Prof. Hommel and Prof. Sayce's arbitrary methods and conclusions the reader may consult, with profit, the works referred to in my article in the NEW YORK REVIEW, Vol. I, p. 180, note I.

[69] It is interesting to remark that Loisy thinks that "in spite of some critics, the episode of Chedorlaomer's campaign is a sufficiently good certificate of personal existence for the Father of the Faithful." (*Etudes Bibliques*, 3d ed., Paris, 1903, p. 176). This conclusion is perfectly sound in itself but does not follow logically from the premises. Cf. Cheyne, *Bible Problems and the New Material for their Solution*, London-New York, 1904, pp. 261-2.

and Arioch were contemporary, and that they reigned over the countries assigned to them in Gen. xiv; the three late inscriptions show also that Kudurlachgumal (if we may so read the name) was King of Elam, and (if Eri-ekua be Eriaku), that he was also a contemporary of Arioch and Amraphel. These facts may be taken as evidence that at least the names Amraphel and Arioch, *possibly* also Chedorla'omer, and Tid'al, were derived by the narrator from some trustworthy source, in which, further, they may have been mentioned together. In addition to this, the monuments bear witness to the fact that several rulers of Babylonia, as well as one Elamite ruler claimed authority over the 'West Land,' and that Sargon of Agade (c. 3800 B. C.) actually subjugated 'the land of Amurri' (the Amorites) on the N. of Canaan; they have shewn consequently that an invasion of Palestine and neighboring countries on the part of a ruler from the far East was, in the abstract, within the military possibilities of the age. They have not shown more than this. They make no mention of the *particular* expedition into Canaan, which forms the principle subject of Gen. xiv; and they name neither Abraham, nor Melchizedek, nor any one of the five Canaanite kings against whom the expedition was directed. Obviously, the monuments cannot 'corroborate' the account of the expedition which they do not mention, or even by implication presuppose. The improbabilities mentioned above may naturally be estimated differently by different minds; but, whatever their weight, they are not neutralized by the inscriptions at present known. The campaign described in Gen. xiv, though particular details are improbable, may in outline be historical; but the evidence that it was so is for the present confined to that which is supplied by the Biblical narrative itself."[70]

In this scholarly statement, Dr. Driver, of Oxford, one of our foremost Biblical critics, has accurately and comprehensively stated what the monuments can teach us concerning the historical character of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. This is also, more or less exactly, the opinion of the majority of the most reliable critics and archaeolo-

[70]Driver's *Commentary on Genesis*, 1904, pp. 172-173, also p. xlix ff, and the same author's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 9th ed., London, 1899, pp. xvii-xviii, as well as his essay on "Hebrew Authority" in Dr. Hogarth's *Authority and Archæology, Sacred and Profane*, London, 1899, pp. 44-45; cf. also G. A. Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, New York, 1902, p. 56 ff; Bevan, A. A., in the *Critical Review*, 1897, pp. 406-15, and vol. iv, 1894, pp. 123-127. Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, etc. . . . 1904, pp. 146-150.

gists, such as Dillmann,[71] Delitzsch,[72] Baudissin,[73] Kittel,[74] Tomkins[75] Gunkel,[76] Jeremias,[77] Driver,[78] Pinches,[79] G. A. Smith,[80] Peters,[81] Bennett,[82] Wade,[83] Addis,[84] Patton,[85] Bacon,[86] Kent,[87] Boscawen,[88]

[71]*Commentary on Genesis*, (Eng. trans.), vol. ii, pp. 29 ff. According to Ewald, Gen. xiv is "the oldest extant record respecting Abraham," and one in which "we see him in the clear light of history." (*History of Israel*, vol. i, p. 307). "The short account in Gen. xiv, sounds thoroughly historical. The names of the north-eastern kings and countries must be derived from a high antiquity, since those of two of the countries nowhere appear again and seem in later ages to have vanished. The kings of the five cities sunk in the Dead Sea have in like manner truly historical names; indeed the whole fragment is full of primeval and almost obsolete names, which the third Narrator felt called upon to explain by appending the names usual in his time. The fact that the chiefs of the other nations conquered by the four confederate kings of the north-east (ver. 5-7) are not given with equal accuracy, may be explained by the supposition that the third Narrator, being interested only in the histories of Abraham and Lot, preferred to shorten the remaining description of this otherwise fully detailed expedition; for the whole narrative looks like a fragment torn from a more general history of Western Asia, merely on account of the mention of Abraham contained in it." *Op. cit.*, p. 308.

[72]*Commentary on Genesis*, (Eng. trans.), vol. i, p. 394 ff.

[73]*Alttestamentliche Priesterthums*, p. 67 ff.

[74]*History of the Hebrews*, (Eng. trans.), vol. i, pp. 175 ff.

[75]*Studies on the Times of Abraham*, London, pp. 166-204; and *Abraham and His Age*, London, 1897, chap. xiii.

[76]*Commentary on Genesis*, (in Nowack's series), Berlin, 1902; and his *Legends of Genesis*, (Eng. trans.), Chicago, 1903.

[77]*Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1904, chap. xiv.

[78]*Commentary on Genesis*, loc. cit.; *Authority and Archæology*, etc., pp. 39-45, and in many articles in Reviews.

[79]*The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, London, 1903, chap. vi.

[80]*Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, New York, 1902, p. 62 and 100.

[81]*Early Hebrew Story*, (Crown Theological Library), New York, 1904, p. 163 ff. "It seems more probable to me that we have here a reminiscence of actual events rather than a romance compounded out of Cuneiform texts and Canaanite legends." "We may fairly argue that we have in this chapter the remembrance of an actual historical event," and on p. 164, "It must be remembered that, as these stories have come down to us in the form of a personal narrative, there is much of detail mixed which is not itself historical or pertinent to the historical narrative." Comp. also the same author's *The Old Testament and the New Scholarship*, New York, 1902, p. 248 ff.

[82]*Biblical Introduction*, New York, 1899, p. 61-62, and *Contemporary Review*, April, 1906, pp. 518-527.

[83]*The Book of Genesis*, London, 1896, p. 95, and *Old Testament History*, London, 1903, p. 83.

[84]*The Documents of the Hexateuch*, London, 1898, vol. ii, pp. 208-213.

[85]*The Early History of Syria and Palestine*, New York, 1901, p. 31 ff.

[86]*Genesis of Genesis*, Hartford, 1892, pp. 123-124.

[87]*Beginnings of Hebrew History*, in the *Student's Old Testament*, New York, 1904, vol. i, p. 85.

[88]*The First of Empires*, London, 1903, p. 174 ff.

Maspero,[89] Ball,[90] MacCurdy,[91] Rogers,[92] Gray,[93] Johns,[94] Bevan,[95] Lagrange,[96] Loisy,[97] Orr,[98] and others. Their opinion can be reduced to the three following conclusions:

I. The narrative of Genesis xiv cannot be altogether legendary or mythical. It must have a substantial historical groundwork, and the many historical data, personages, localities and events there alluded to are sufficient guarantee of its general historical value.

II. Many of its details, however, such as the names of the five Kings of the Plains, and of the various Canaanitish races and places, the military route followed by the allied kings and their *utter* defeat in a single night by Abraham's 318 men, and his pursuit of them as far as Damascus, and the episode of Melchizedek, are considered as possessing less historical value. They show the hand of a later editor and compiler who in order to explain an old and rather obscure narrative, and at the same time, to exalt the Father of the Hebrews and the priesthood of Jerusalem, added several historical and geographical data of questionable accuracy. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that, as we shall see, the literary analysis of the narrative as it stands, shows that it is of different date and authorship from the four principal documents of the Pentateuch, and that in substance, diction and style, it presents the mark of an old historical document intermingled with later, probably post-exilic, glosses and additions.

III. Modern archaeological discoveries have shown that at least three of the four Mesopotamian kings,—i. e., Amraphel=Hammurabi; Arioch=Eri-Aku, and Chedorlaomer=Kudur-Laga-mar,—are historical personages, that they were contemporaries and that they ruled over the countries named in Gen. xiv. They also prove that in the Abrahamic age the Elamite power was extending not only over Babylonia but also over Canaan and consequently, they conclusively

[89] *Histoire Ancienne des peuples de l' Orient Classique*, Paris, 1897, vol. ii, pp. 48, 49, 50. (Translated into English in 3 vols.)

[90] *Light From the East, or the Witness of the Monuments*, London, 1899, pp. 65 ff.

[91] *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, vol. i, New York, 1895, chap. ii.

[92] *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. i, New York, 1901, p. 381 ff, and 390 ff.

[93] *Expositor*, May, 1898.

[94] *Expository Times*, August, 1899, and his article *Code of Hammurabi*, in the Extra Volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

[95] *Op. cit., loc. cit.*

[96] *Historical Criticism and the Old Testament*, (*La Methode Historique*, etc.), London, 1905, ch. v.

[97] *Op. cit., loc. cit.*

[98] *The Problem of the Old Testament*, New York, 1906, pp. 402 ff.

show that the campaign of Chedorlaomer and his allies against Canaan was not only "within the military possibilities of the age," as Dr. Driver mildly puts it,[99] but that it was even probable; and finally they give grounds for the belief that many of the historical, geographical, and chronological data are based on some old Canaanitish or, more probably, Assyro-Babylonian documents, with which either the original author or the final redactor of the chapter was acquainted. But it must be remembered that these same Assyro-Babylonian monuments do not in any way affirm that such an expedition ever took place, nor of course do they give any confirmation to the victory of the four Mesopotamian Kings, their subsequent defeat by Abraham, the incident of Melchizedek, nor any other particular event mentioned in the Genesiac narrative.

The literary analysis of chapter xiv shows, as most critics agree, that it is full of unusual literary, historical and linguistic features which give to it a position peculiar to itself in the Pentateuch. Kuenen rightly argues,—and in this he is followed by Dillmann, Delitzsch, Halévy, Gunkel, Driver and others,—that the chapter is in its proper place, for it pre-supposes Lot's separation from Abraham, and his settlement in Sodom (Gen. xiii, 5, 7-11 a, 12 b, 13).[1] The peculiar features of the chapter can be stated as follows:

I. It represents Abraham in a new light, quite different from that in which we see him elsewhere. From a man of pacific disposition, obedient, thankful, unselfish, leading a pastoral and nomadic life, he is transformed into a high-minded and independent general. He is in league with kings and princes for offensive and defensive purposes. He has an army of several hundred *trained* men and servants strong enough to put to rout in a single night a confederation of four powerful Mesopotamian kings. He is no longer a leader of flocks but a leader of warriors. He appears as a hero and his feat of arms is given a setting in a frame of international history;[2] and while in Gen. xii, 16, Abraham is disposed to accept presents, here he would not take from a king even as much as a shoe-latchet.[3] It is true that this portrait of the man may be viewed as completing his character, but the contrast with his usual habits and occupations seems almost too marked. This contrast led Knobel to believe that Gen. xiv may

[99] *Authority and Archæology*, London, 1899, p. 44.
[1] *The Hexateuch*, p. 143.
[2] Comp. Dillmann's *Genesis*, vol. ii, p. 29, and Delitzsch's *Genesis*, vol. i, p. 394.
[3] Driver's *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 155.

have been derived from the famous but lost "Book of Wars of Yahweh," mentioned in Num. xxi, 14.[4]

II. Nowhere in the whole of the Old Testament do we meet with a narrative so full of numerous and unknown historical, archæological and geographical data and notices as in this remarkable chapter of Genesis. The author or redactor of it delves into documentary history, chronology, geography and indulges even in geology as when he speaks of the Vale of Siddim, with its numerous slime pits (verse 10). His enumeration of the many old, extinct and forgotten races of prehistoric Palestine, which has such a striking analogy with Deut. ii, 10-12, 20; and his description of the military operations of both conquerors and conquered are simply astounding in a document written in very ancient times, and still more so in the hypothesis of its late post-exilic origin.

III. Many words and expressions in our chapter are not found elsewhere in the Old Testament, or at least not in the Pentateuch: such are the words "Possessor or Creator of Heaven and Earth" קנה שמים וארץ (vs. 19, 22); "Confederate with" בעלי ברית (ver. 13); "Proved or Trained Men" חניך (ver. 14); "drew out" said of men, הריק (ver. 14); or others like" God Most High," אל עליון (vs. 18-20, 22); "to deliver," מגן (ver. 20); "to enrich," העשיר (ver. 23); also several archaic or peculiar names of places, such as Bela for Zoar (vs. 2, 8), Vale of Siddim for the Dead Sea (vs. 3, 8, 10), Ashteroth-Karnaim (ver. 5), Zuzim for Zamzummim (ver. 5), El-Paran (ver. 6), En-Mishpat for Kadesh (ver. 7), Hazazon-tamar for En-Gedi (ver. 7), Vale of Shaveh for the King's Vale (ver. 17), Salem for Jerusalem (ver. 18), etc. Finally in some places the language is rather archaic, while in others it is quite simple.[5]

IV. The linguistic peculiarities of our chapter as compared with those of the other documentary sources of the Pentateuch—the Elohist, the Yahwist and the Priestly Code—are of interest but extremely puzzling. W. H. Green is not mistaken when he says that the critics find their chief perplexity in the fact that this chapter, on the one hand, is related to all the documents of the Pentateuch, and yet, on the other, has so many peculiarities that it cannot be

[4]Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 395.

[5]Cf. Dillmann *op. cit.*, p. 30; Delitzsch, 395; Driver, *op. cit.*, loc. cit.; Addis, *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, vol. ii, pp. 208-209; W. H. Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, p. 197; and Gunkel and Holzinger in their commentaries on Genesis in the Nowack and Marti Series respectively.

brought into harmony with any of them.[6] It has, in fact, the diffuseness and particuliarity of P in vs. 8, 9, the P words רכוש "goods" (vs. 11, 12, 16, 21), נפש "soul" for persons (ver. 21), ילידי ביתו "born in the house" (ver. 14), as xvii, 12, 13, 23, 27; Lev. xxii, 11; calls Lot Abram's brother's son (ver. 12), as xi, 27, 31; xii, 5. At the same time it has the J words יהוה "Yahweh" (ver. 22), לקראת "to meet" (ver. 17), ברוך "blessed";[7] it brings Abraham into connection with Salem or Jerusalem, the future site of the Temple, to whose priests he pays tithes (vs. 18-20)—which is held to be indicative of J, who is reputed to belong to Judah—it calls Lot Abraham's brother (v. 14), as xiii, 8, speaks of him as dwelling in Sodom (ver. 12), as xiii, 12 b; and Abraham as dwelling by the oaks of Mamre (ver. 13), as xiii, 18; connects Admah and Zeboiim with Sodom and Gomorrah (vers. 2, 8), as x, 19, and Zoar, as xix, 23, while yet Sodom and Gomorrah are accorded the precedence (vs. 10. 11), and particularly Sodom (vs. 17, 21, 22), as xiii, 10; xviii, 20, 26; ch. xix. Other words, like many of those mentioned above, as well as the alliance with native princes (ver. 13), as xxi, 32, and the warlike achievement (ver. 15), as xlviii, 22, and the expression בלעדי "nothing for me" (ver. 24), the "Amorite" instead of Canaanite (vs. 7, 13), as Num. xxi, 21; Josh. xxiv, 8, 12; the word פליט "escaped" (ver. 13), and מרד "rebelled" (ver. 4), etc., show affinity with the Elohist.[8]

According to Kuenen, "ch. xiv does not belong to JE, from which it differs in point of form, besides being excluded by ch. xviii ff. But neither can it be taken from P^2, for it falls outside the scope of the work and is written in a wholly different style. Moreover, it is of very recent date, however archaic it may be in form. . . . Affinities with P^2 are betrayed in the use of רכוש (v. 12, 16, 21), נפש (v. 21), ילדי ביתו (v. 14); this last phenomenon might, indeed, be explained on the supposition of R's having worked up some more ancient fragment; but this could only be allowed if the antiquity of the passage were really established, which is far from being the

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 196, and T. Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 107, 108, 337, 339, 351, 413, 531, 370, etc., etc.

[7] "The expression, 'Blessed be—of',—found nowhere else in Scripture in this form, has been recently discovered by Sayce in the inscription of some Semitic pilgrims to Egypt of the age of Jeremiah, of whom one subscribes himself "Servant of Nebo." The only certainty regarding the inscription is the fact that the writers were of the time of the Exile and were Semites but not Hebrews, with some probability that they came from Mesopotamia (See *Hebraica* for July, 1890)," Bacon, *Genesis of Genesis*, p. 124, in note.

[8] W. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 196-197.

case."[9] Dillmann says that all these linguistic and literary phenomena, taken together, "force us, in the first place, to the supposition that the narrative comes from an independent source. But seeing it mentions Dan (ver. 2, 7 f, 14, 17), it must have passed through the hands of a later redactor".[10] He regards the Elohist as the most probable source, while Delitzsch, following Hupfeld, Kaiser and others, believes it belongs to the Jahwist.[11] Addis states that "the chapter as we have it, is late . . . and in its present form it presupposes the existence of the whole Pentateuch" . . . and that "it was added to the Pentateuch, when its framework was already complete by union of the older documents with P";[12] while, according to Driver, "the style and phraseology of the chapter show that it does not belong to either J, E, or P, but that it is taken from some independent source, (hence SS-special source); it has some affinities with P, but they are not sufficiently marked to justify its being attributed to him; the general style and literary character of the narrative suggest, however, that it is not of earlier date than the age of Ezekiel and the Exile."[13] Dr. Driver's opinion is that of the majority of modern Biblical critics and commentators, as against those of scholars like König, Hommel, Sayce, Hummelauer, Vigouroux, W. Green, Hoberg, Halévy, and others.

As to its unity, there is no doubt that the narrative, as we have it now, contains glosses and interpolations, and that it has undergone re-editing. These glosses are mostly illustrative of obscure passages and names, and it is not improbable that the Melchizedek episode was added to the original narrative in order to exalt the antiquity and sanctity of the Jerusalem priesthood, and to enforce the right of sacerdotal tithes. Halévy, however, with the rest of the conservative school, asserts that "Le chapitre xiv porte les marques les plus évidentes d'une rédaction unique. Il n'y a pas une seule expression hétérogene ou parasite ou l'on puisse voir le main d'un compilateur de narrations différentes ou celle d'un glossateur qui insère ses remarques dans le corps du texte."[14]

---

[9] *The Hexateuch*, p. 324.

[10] *Commentary on Genesis*, vol. ii, p. 30 ff.

[11] *Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i, p. 395.

[12] *Documents of the Hexateuch*, vol. ii, p. 208-209.

[13] *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 155. See also Bennett, *Biblical Introduction*, p. 62; and Wade, *The Book of Genesis*. p. 95.

[14] *Recherches Bibliques*, vol. i, Paris, 1895, p. 332.

Amraphel and Hammurabi.

The identification of Amraphel with Hammurabi, the sixth king of the first Semitic dynasty of Babylon and the most venerable law-giver of antiquity, is asserted by the majority of Assyriologists and Biblical critics. The identification was first suggested by Dr. Eberhard Schrader,[15] who based his suggestion: (I) on the phonetic similarity of the two names;[16] (II) on the contemporary date of Hammurabi and Abraham,[17] and (III) on an inscription in which he is said to have overcome a ruler named Rim-Sin, or Rim-Aku, identified by the late George Smith, of the British Museum, with the Arioch or Eri-Aku, who is mentioned in Gen. xiv as King of Larsa and contemporary and ally of Amraphel in their expedition to Canaan.[18]

Since 1883, the year of Dr. Schrader's publication of his memoir, further Assyriological discoveries have demonstrated that phonetically speaking, the identity of the two names is beyond dispute. In one of the numerous contract tablets drawn up during Hammurabi's reign, at Sippara, the city of the Sun-god, it was found, (I) that his name began not with the hard guttural *Kh*, but the *h* or ח, i. e., Hammurabi, and not Khammurabi, which gives a satisfactory solution of the change of Ham חם in the Babylonian form of the name into Am אם of the Hebrew rendering.[19] Furthermore, in one of the letters of Asharidu, written several centuries after the time of Hammurabi, the name is given as Ammurapi,[20] which is exactly the same as the Hebrew form

[15]*Die Keilinschriftliche babylonische Konigliste*, in the *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. pruss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1887, p. 600-605.

[16]The apparent dissimilarity of the two names was solved by Schrader who reasoned that אמרפל "Amrapel" should be אמרפי "Amrapi;" and that the ח *h*, of the Babylonian form of the name was often neglected in the pronunciation and rendered as א, as in the case of Hamatu, חמת, which is given as Amatu. See Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques*, vol. i, pp. 338-9, and Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes*, vol. i, p. 493.

[17]See further down on the chronology of the periods.

[18]See below for the identification of Rim-Sin with Arioch.

[19]The interchange of ח h with א or ' in the various Semitic languages is very common, especially in late Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions; and as early as the Tell-el-amarna letters (Comp. Sayce *The Early History of the Hebrews*, London, 1897, p. 26) (note); and Hommel, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 192-193 (note); (xv cent. B. C.) the interchange of *p* and *b* was also very common.

[20]The inscription as given in Dr. Pinches' book *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, p. 21, runs as follows: "To the king, my Lord, thy servant Asharidu, Nebo and Merodach to the king of the countries, my lord be favorable. The tablet which the king makes is bad and incomplete. Now a tablet, an old one, of Ammurapi the king, I have made and written out—it is of the time of Ammurapi the King. And I have sent (to inform

Amrapel, except the letter *l*, which will be discussed further on. This shows that the Semitic Babylonians of the first millennium before Christ neglected the pronunciation of the guttural or aspirate ח, *h*, substituting for it the easier corresponding sound of א, or '—. Hence a Hebrew writer of the exilic and even ante-exilic times was more than justified in writing Amrapi instead of Hammurabi.[21] In a list of kings' names, first published by Pinches, the five syllables of the name of Hammurabi, i. e., Ha-am-mu-ra-bi, are written in the ideographic column and their rendering is given in the opposite column as *Kimta-rapashtu*, hence the hypothesis that the real ordinary name of the king in question was Kimta-rapashtu and that the form Hammurabi was used only in official inscriptions and contract-tablets. Halévy thinks that phonetically the form "Kimta-rapashtu" is nearer to the Hebrew "Amraphel" than is the form "Hammurabi."[22] He argues that in the form "Kimta-rapashtu," or כמתרפשת, we have all the three middle consonants of the form "Amraphel," אמרפל i. e., the מ, the ר and the פ; while in the form "Hammurabi" only two of the middle consonants i. e., מ, and ר are in common. Furthermore, he remarks that the Assyrian *sh* when followed by dentals is often pronounced as *l*, hence we would have Kimta-rapaltu, in which are found the last four consonants of the form "Amra-pel," i. e., מ ר פ ל. Now, according to the same scholar (and in this he is at variance with other Assyriologists) the element *Kimta* means "family" or multitude," just as the first element of the form Amraphel, i. e., *'Am* or *'Am*, means also "family," "gens," and "multitude;" and by substituting *'Am* for *Kimta* we have the equation Kimta-rapaltu=Am-rapaltu, and by dropping the final *t*, which, according to Halévy, is rather common in Semitic proper names,[23] we have the perfect equation of Amrapal and Amrapel.

According to the majority of Assyriologists, however, the first element of the name Hammu-rabi, i. e., "Hammu" or "Ammu," is the name of a god, for it is found in many compound names, such

---

the king) from Babylon I will bring (it). The king (will be able to do) the work at once. . . . "

[21]Other variants of the name are Ammi-rabi and Hammum-rabi.

[22]*Recherches Bibliques*, vol. i, p. 339 ff.

[23]ex. gr. the name of the Assyrian King Shalman-asharidu is given in the Bible as שלמנאסר, Shalmaneser; the Nabatean name חרתת, Harethat, appears among the Syrians and the Arabs as Harith and Al-Harith; and the goddess Astarte, עשתרת appears in Moabite as עשתר, 'astar, in Aramaic עתר, in Sabaean עתתר, and in Assyrian as Ishtar.

as Sumu-hammu, Jasdi-hammu, Zimri-hammu, Ammi-Zaduga, Ammi-Satana, etc., and the second element, "rabi," is very common in Assyro-Babylonian, as well as in all Semitic languages, meaning "great;" hence the full name means "the god Ammu is great," on the same analogy as names like Sin-rabi, Samas-rabi, etc.[24] Dr. Pinches considers Amraphel to be a Semitic name: "Amar-apla"-"Amar-pal," i. e., "I see a son," or "Amra-apla"="Amrapal," i. e., "see a son."[25]

From the above it is evident that the greatest difficulty in the complete identification of the two names rests on the presence, in the Hebrew form, of the *l*, which is not found in the original Babylonian name. To account for it, three hypotheses, equally propable and acceptable, have been advanced. The first, maintained by Sayce and Lindle, holds that *el* in Amraphel stands for *ilu* which in Babylonian means "god," and that, like many Babylonian kings of the period, Hammurabi was regarded as a god, and

---

[24]According to Dr. Prince, however, "the name of Hammaurbi seems to be a combination of *hammu*, "ruler," and *rabi* "great," i. e., "great ruler." The word *hammu* occurs in the proper name Nabu-hammu-ilani, II. Rawlinson, 64, 48 a. The stem *hamamu* means "rule," "lead," cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Handworterbuch*, p. 282 a, and Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrian Dictionary*, p. 320 a." "*The Code of Hammurabi*" in the *American Journal of Theology*, 1904, July, p. 602, note 4. According to Hommel, *Ammu* or *Hammu* is the name of the goddess "Moon;" while Boscawen, derives the word from the root *Khamamu* which means "law." According to him this is beyond doubt when we look at some examples. There is a passage in the legend where Zu steals the tablets of law and destiny from the god Bel, which reads, "I will seize the tablets of destiny and the laws (*terite*) of all the gods. I will legislate (*akhmum*), etc." Again we meet with the word *Khamimat gimir parzi*, "the dictator of decrees" applied to Ishtar (King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, p. 225). Both Ammu and Khammu are no doubt cognates, and we find the former used in the code text (col. iv, 53, 54), "who directs the law, to adjudge decisions (ammi)." So that the reading of the name Hammurabi is but a variation or a paraphrase, meaning "the great Decider of Law," and "the law is widespread," where *Kimti* is for *Kinti* (law). So also this reading supplies us with a concise rendering of the Ammi-Zadugga of the same list, *Kimta Kittim* ("the law is established"). *The First of Empires*, London, 1903, p. 178.

[25]*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Amraphel" (Ryle). In the Septuagint the name appears as Αμαρφελ, while in Josephus (Antiq. *Jud.* i, ix.) as Αμαραψιδης. In 1872, Dr. Schrader suggested that the name is composed of *amir*, "master" or "king," "prince," etc., and *phal* or *pal*, contracted from *habal* meaning "son," i. e., "the son is king," or "my son is king," on the same analogy as names like Zir-nahid, Abu-ramu, Habal-nahid, Dayyan-nahid, Sar-nahid, Amir-sin or Amil-sin, which have analogous meanings and formations. *Zeitschrift der Deutchen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*, tom. xxvii, 1872, p. 157, and *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 1872, p. 46-47. Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, 1828, said that "Etymon nominis, in lingua Assyriaca haud dubio quærendum, pandat, qui possit." Cf. Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes*, vol. i, p. 492-493, in note.

was consequently addressed "ilu-Ammirabi" or "Ammirabi-ilu," i. e., "Hammurabi the god," just as the Romans spoke of "Divus Cæsar," "Divus Augustus," etc. Now Ammirabi-ilu or Ammirapi-ilu is letter for letter the Amrapel of Genesis.[26] The second hypothesis, advanced by Dr. Pinches, maintains that "this additional letter *l* is due to the faulty reading of a variant writing of the name, with a polyphonous character having the value of *pil* as well as *bi*—which form may in fact still be found."[27] Hence, according to this hypothesis, the cuneiform syllabic or ideographic sign representing the last syllable of the name Hammurabi, owing to the double phonetic value of the same, could have been read either *bi* or *pil*, hence Hammurabi or Hommurapil=Amraphel. The third hypothesis, advanced by Dr. Hüsing, suggests that the *l* at the end of the form "Amraphel" is superfluous, and he would join it to the next word, and read "And it came to pass in the days of *Amraph*, as Arioch, King of Ellasar was over Shinar, that Chedorlaomer, etc., etc."[28] Whichever of these three hypotheses we accept, the fact remains that the *phonetic identification* of Amraphel and Hammurabi is extremely probable and almost certain.

The political situation, furthermore, presupposed by Gen. xiv, reflects with a remarkable degree of accuracy the condition of the times of Hammurabi. "The leader of the forces, and the suzerain to whom the Canaanitish princes were subject, was a king of Elam, i. e., Chedorlaomer. Elam, therefore, must have been the predominant power at the time, and the Babylonian king (Amraphel) must have been its vassal. The narrative, nevertheless, is dated in the reign of the Babylonian king and not in that of the King of Elam, and it is to the reign of the Bobylonian king that the events described in it are attached. Babylonia, however, was not a united country; there

---

[26] *The Early History of the Hebrews*, London, 1897, pp. 25-26. Dr. Lindle, who has made a special study of the Hammurabi inscripions and contract-tablets, affirms that in these the word "ilu," god, is often attached to that of Hammurabi. It is of interest to note that Dr. Sayce in his *Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, ed. 5th, London, 1895, p. 166, stated, "If we are to identify Arioch with Eri-Aku, we must identify Amraphel either with Khammurabi or with his predecessor. Sin-Muballit. But it is difficult to find a resemblance between the names, and the attempts of Assyriologists to transmute Amraphel into Khammurabi, or Khrammurabi into Amraphel, have not been very happy."

[27] *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, London, 1903, p. 211.

[28] Cf. C. H. W. Johns, *The Code of Hammurabi*, in the extra vol. of Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 87, col. a.

was another king, Arioch of Ellasar, who divided with Amraphel of Shinar the government of it, and, like Amraphel, acknowledged the supremacy of Elam. Finally the "Nations," or Goiim, whoever they were, were also subject to Elam, as well as the distant province of Canaan, etc."[29] Now if we turn our glance to the political situation of Western Asia at the time of Hammurabi, as it is represented to us by contemporary monuments and inscriptions,[30] we shall find them to be in striking accord with the data of the xivth chapter of Genesis.

Two objections have been advanced against the identity of Hammurabi and Amraphel. One is historical, the other chronological. Hammurabi left numerous inscriptions, especially one in which all the principal events of forty-three years of his reign are carefully recorded in chronological order; and yet he fails to mention any expedition to Syria and Palestine, which was then called the "land of the Amurru" or "the Amorites," and "Martu," or "the West." He expressly mentions his contemporary Rim-Sin, or Eriaku, the Arioch of Gen. xiv, and explicitly affirms that in the thirty-first year of his reign, by the command of Anu and Bel, he established his advantage and captured the land of Yamuthab (or Elam) and the King Rimalum Sin or Arioch.[31] Yet no mention whatever is made of his alliance with the latter or of their joint expedition against Canaan. The objection, undoubtedly, carries with it a certain amount of weight, but, as Dr. Pinches remarks, "It must not be supposed that this in any wise invalidates the trustworthiness of the narrative in the xivth chapter of Genesis—there is plenty of room in the mutilated list for a date referring to this to have been recorded, though we must keep in mind the possibility that if the Babylonian king considered that disaster had in any way overtaken his arms, he may not have recorded it at all. Then there is the fact, that the expedition was undertaken in conjunction with allies—Chedorlaomer, Tidal, and Arioch—for none of whom, in all probability, Hammurabi had any sympathy. The Elamite was

[29]Sayce, *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*, London-New York, (1903), pp. 56-57; and the same author's *Patriarchal Palestine*, London, 1895, p. 65 ff; and *The Early History of the Hebrews*, p. 22, 25, and *passim*.

[30]See the writer's article on the "Code of Hammurabi," in the NEW YORK REVIEW, 1905, Aug.-Sept., p. 191 ff. In one of his inscriptions Hammurabi calls himself *Adda Martu* or "ruler of the West land," an expression commonly denoting Syria, Phenicia and Palestine, and implying, consequently, that he claimed sovereignty over Canaan, although it does not mention any military expedition undertaken by him into those regions.

[31]The inscription is given in Pinches, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-214.

a conqueror from a land over which the Babylonians of earlier ages held sway, and Arioch had dominion over a neighboring tract, to which Hammurabi himself laid claim, and over which, as the inscriptions show, he afterwards ruled. Hammurabi, moreover, claimed also the West Land—mat Amurri (the land of Amurru) as his hereditary possession, and he found himself obliged to aid Chedorlaomer, Tidal, and Arioch to subjugate it; it was indeed, Chedorlaomer whom the five kings had acknowledged for twelve years as their overlord, and against whom, in the thirteenth, they rebelled. It is, therefore, likely that Hammurabi regarded himself as having been forced by circumstances to aid Chedorlaomer to reconquer what really belonged to Babylonia, and the probability that he would cause it to be used as one of the events to date by is on that account still less, even if the news of any success, which he might have considered himself entitled to, reached his own domain in time to be utilized for such a purpose."[32]

The second objection, based on chronology, is due to the fact that, according to several Assyriologists, there is a difference of several centuries between the age of Hammurabi and that of Abraham. But, in spite of the painstaking and elaborate efforts that have been made, it must be confessed that not even a fairly approximate chronology of those times has as yet been worked out. The materials for such a chronology at our disposal are still scarce and imperfect. It is true that we have good grounds for affirming that Hammurabi lived about 2250 B. C. Yet it is entirely possible that he might have lived somewhere around 2150 B. C., or even 2000 B. C., a period of 200 years being but a small margin for errors in such a calculation. According to a recently discovered[33] chronological register of part of the first Babylonian dynasty, to which Hammurabi belonged, Hammurabi's reign lasted 43 years. The dates set for it by modern writers are: 2376-2333 according to Sayce, 2342-2288 according to Rogers, 2287-2232 according to Maspero, *circa* 2200 according to King, and 2130-2087 according to Hommel,—the difference between the extremes being about 250 years, although we must admit that the date 2285-2225 is the most probable.[34] Now, according to the most acceptable Biblical

[32]op. cit. p. 214-215.

[33]L. W. King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, vol. iii, London, 1900, pp. lvi-lxxi, 212,-153; and Pinches, *op. cit.*, p. 211 ff.

[34]See Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1900, vol. i, pp. 313-348; Sayce, *Early History of Israel*, p. 281; Hommel, *Expository Times*, vol. x, 1899, p. 211 ff; L. W. King, *op. cit.*, vol. i Introduction; L. B. Paton, *Early History of Syria and*

chronology, and assuming as correct Ussher's date for the reign of Solomon (1014-975 B. C.) and that the fourth year of Solomon, the year in which the Temple was built, corresponds to the 480th year from the Exodus, we get the following dates for the Exodus, for the migration of Jacob into Egypt and for the call of Abraham:

	Hebrew.	Samaritan.	LXX.
The Exodus	1491	1491	1491
Jacob's migration into Egypt	1921	1706	1706
Call of Abraham	2136	1921	1921

But both the internal and the monumental evidence conclusively shows that none of these dates can be approximately correct, and that no valid chronology can be drawn from Genesis. Hence, as far as Biblical and Assyro-Eygptian chronologies are interpreted by the various biblical scholars, Assyriologists and Egyptologists, Abraham may have lived two centuries before or two centuries after the age of Hammurabi, and consequently, the objection against the identification of Amraphel and Hammurabi, from a chronological standpoint, is void of any result.[35] The probability remains, therefore, that, all data considered, the age of Abraham approximately corresponds to that of Hammurabi.

Arioch, Rim-Sin and Eri-Aku.

If the identification of Arioch, King of Ellasar, with Rim-Sin or Eri-Aku, King of Larsa, can be established, it would undoubtedly strengthen that of Amraphel with Hammurabi. From the monuments we know that Rim-Sin, son of Kudurmabug, was King of Yamuthbalu, and was defeated by Hammurabi in the thirty-first of the latter's reign. According to two inscriptions, Rim-Sin was King of Larsa, Nippur, and Ur, and the conqueror of Eridu and Nisin, in southern Babylonia. He was not of Babylonian or Semitic, but (as the name of his father shows), of Elamite origin. The inscriptions also show that at the time of Rim-Sin and that of his father, Kudurmabug, the Elamite power had extended also to the land of "Martu," or the West land, i. e., Canaan, and that after the defeat of Rim-Sin by Hammurabi,

Palestine, 1901, chap. iii and iv; Boscawen, *The First of Empires*, London, 1903, pp. 178 ff, and the writer's article on Hammurabi in the NEW YORK REVIEW, *loc. cit.*

[35]For a very presentable and intelligible discussion of the Biblical Babylonian and Egyptian chronologies of the period of Abraham, Hammurabi and the Exodus, and the difficulties which attach to them, the reader is referred to Dr. Driver's *Commentary on Genesis*, in the *Westminster Series*, London, 1904, pp. xxv-xxxi.

the latter incorporated the conquered province of Canaan to that of Babylon, assuming the title of King of Martu. The political career of Rim-Sin, therefore, taken in connection with the events of his contemporary, Hammurabi, admirably corresponds to that of Arioch, of the xivth chapter of Genesis, who could have participated in the campaign against the five Kings of the Plain before his own defeat and overthrow by Hammurabi.[36]

The only difficulty in establishing the identity of Arioch and Rim-Sin is the apparent dissimilarity of the two names, but the difficulty is more apparent than real, as Rim-Sin had two names, the one Semitic, i. e., Rim-Sin, which means "servant of the moon-god"[37] or "grace of Sin,"[38] the other Sumerian, Eri-Aku, having the same meaning, just as Theodorus and Deodatus, or Cornelius von Stein and Cornelius a Lapide. The king, although Elamite by descent, was ruling over a country in which the Semitic-Babylonian element was predominant, and hence he was known by two names.[39] George Smith, as early

---

[36]The literary remains and inscriptions of King Rim-Sin have been collected and edited by Prof. Ira Price, of Chicago. *Some Literary Remains of Rim-Sin (Arioch), King of Larsa*, about 2285 B. C., Chicago, 1904. Some of these were already published by Lenormant and H. Rawlinson, and translated by Winckler in Schrader's *Keilinschrift Bibliothek*, vol. iii. Comp. also Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes*, vol. i, pp. 489 ff; Pinches, *op. cit.*, pp. 216 ff; Ball, *Light From the East*, 1899, pp. 66-67; Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 40 f, 166-168, 184, 189; Boscawen, *op. cit.*, p. 174 ff; Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 2d edit., 1883, p. 135 ff; and "Uber Ursprung, Sinn und Aussprache der Altbabylonischen Königsnamen NIT-(AN)-IN-ZI," in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Royal Academy of Berlin, 1894, pp. 279-291.; Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 214 ff; Sayce, in his various works quoted above, and the Histories of Assyria and Babylonia by Brunengo, Hommel, Tiele, Rogers, Goodspeed, Maspero, etc. The inscription of Kudurmabug mentioning his son Rim-Sin, or Eri-Aku, runs as follows: "To Nannara, his king, Kudurmabug, father of the land of the Amorites (i. e., Canaan), son of Simti-Shilhak. When Nannara received his prayer he made for Nannara *ne-zila-maha* for his life and the life of his son Eri-Aku (Rim-Sin), King of Larsa."

The tablet of Eri-Aku mentioning his own royal titles and the name of his father runs as follows: "Eri-Aku, the powerful hero, the everlasting shepherd installed by Bel, the nourisher of Uriwa, the King of Larsa, the King of Sumer and Akkad, the son of Kudurmabug, the father (or ruler) of Yamuthbalu, am I, etc. . . ."

Hammurabi's colophon in which he mentions his victory over Eri-Aku, runs as follows: "Year 31: Year Hammurabi, the King, by command of Anu and Bel, established his advantage and captured the land of Yamuthbalum and the King Rim-Sin."

[37]Boscawen, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

[38]Pinches, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

[39]Comp. Schrader, sup. cit., Pinches, *op. cit.*, p. 217; *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology*, vol. xiii, p. 159, and *The Old Testament in the Light of the His-*

as 1874, already suggested the identity of Rim-Sin with Eri-Sin or Eri-Aku.[40] Other scholars, however, pointed out that in some of Kudurmabug's inscriptions the name of his son is written not Rim-Sin, or Rim-Aku, but Eri-Sin, or Eri-Aku; but Winckler, in republishing a text formerly edited by Lenormant,[41] demonstrated that the name of the son of Kudurmabug is there written Ri-im-sin,[42] which, as Pinches remarks, if correctly copied, practically settles the matter of their identity.[43] The same scholar also states that "even without this identification (of Winckler), it is exceedingly probable that these (Rim-Sin and Eri-Sin) are two forms of the same name, and that in all cases it is the same ruler who is meant. They are both called King of Uriwa, King of Larsa, and King of Sumer and Akkad. In the inscriptions Eri-Sin or Eri-Aku also calls himself *adda Emutbala*, "father of Yamuthbalu," and, as can be seen from the colophon of the thirty-first year of Hammurabi, the king whose name he writes Rim-Sin or Rim-Aku, is called by him king of that region."[44]

In 1883, Eberhard Schrader declared the identity of Rim-Sin or Eri-Aku with the Arioch of Genesis to be certain. "Arioch, King of Ellasar, is, according to my opinion, undoubtedly identical with Eri-Aku."[45] In 1886, C. P. Tiele attacked Schrader's identification[46] but was refuted by the latter.[47] Since then the identity of the two names has been commonly accepted by the majority of Assyriologists

torical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia, p. 218. The double name of Arioch i. e. Rim-Sin and Eri-Aku may be due to motives of policy inspired by the fact that he was ruling over a country inhabited by two distinct peoples. Whether the double name was given to him by his father, King Kudurmabug, or by the people, or was chosen by himself after his accession to the throne is of secondary importance. Such double names were common in Babylonia and Assyria even in later times, and frequent instances can be drawn from hagiographic nomenclature and from mediveal history in the East and in the West. The Semitic name of Arioch, i. e., Rim-Sin, is modelled after that of his predecessor Rim-Anu, "the servant of Anu," and other names like Sin-iddinam "Sin has given,," Sin-muballit, Sennacherib, etc. . . . By some old Assyriologists the name has been read as Arad-Sin, which, although strictly speaking possible is nevertheless improbable. See Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques* tom. i, p. 338.

[40]*Notes on the Early History of Assyria and Babylonia*, p. 12, and Lenormant, *La langue primitive de la Chaldée*, p. 374, 375.

[41]*Choix de textes cunéiforms inédits*, No. 70.

[42]*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, vol. iii, part i, pp. 88-89.

[43]*op. cit.*, p. 216.

[44]*op. cit.*, p. 217.

[45]*Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 1883, p. 135.

[46]In his *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1886, vol. i, p. 123, 124.

[47]In his Memoir of 1894, sup. cit.

and Biblical critics.[48] In 1896, Dr. Pinches, of the British Muesum, published a series of epic fragments which, in his opinion, mention the names of a certain Eri-E-a-ku and a certain Tu-ud-khul. These he identified with Arioch and Tidal or Tidgal of Gen. xiv.[49] L. W. King,[50] Tiele,[51] and Bezold,[52] however, called the two readings in question; although Sayce,[53] Hommel,[54] and Pinches himself,[54] still maintain the correctness of the first reading.[56]

Chedorlaomer and Tidal. [57]

Next to the name of Amraphel, that of Chedorlaomer has excited the most animated discussion among Assyriologists. It has long been acknowledged that the name as we have it in the Hebrew text, i. e., Chedorloamer, or still better in the Septuagint i. e., Chodollogomor–Chedor-logamar–Kudur-lagamar (with the exchange of the glottle-catch ע, with the *g*, (just as עמורה 'Amorah, and Gomorrah), is of perfect Elamite name-formation, such as Kudur-Mabug, Kudur-Nankhundi, etc. As early as 1871 and 1875, Oppert,[58] Fox Talbot,[59] and Finzi,[60] had demonstrated that the first element of the name, i. e., *Kudur*, means "servant," for it is translated in Assyrian by *Tuklat*, which means "servitude," and "adoration" or "worship;"[61] while

---

[48]Winckler, Zimmern, Berzold, Hommel, Sayce, Pinches, Halévy. Oppert, L. W. King, Johns, Jeremias, Dillmann, Delitzsch, Boscawen, Paton, Rogers, Ball, Vigouroux, Gunkel, MacCurdy, Meyer, Ed., Driver, and others.

[49]*Journal of the Victoria Institute*, vol. xxix, pp. 45-90.

[50]*Letters and Inscriptions of King Hammurabi*, vol. i, p. xxv-xxxvi.

[51]*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1900, p. 395 f.

[52]*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1900, p. 400.

[53]*Expository Times*, March. 1899, p. 267, and Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*: "Arioch."

[54]Comp. J. Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament*, London-New York, p. 412, note I.

[55]*op. cit.*, loc. cit.

[56]See L. B. Paton, *The Early History of Syria and Palestine*, New York, 1901, p. 33.

[57]In Hebrew כדרלעמר, "Chedorla'omer," in the Septuagint version, Χοδολλογομόρ "Chodollogomor," and in the reading of the Western Hebrew Manuscripts (Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, London, 1897, p. 203 f). "Chedorlo'mer." The name of the fourth king appears in the Hebrew text as תדעל, Tid'al, in the Septuagint as Ταργαλ, Targal, and in the Syriac version as Tar'il, the exchange of *r* and *d* being due to the similarity in the Hebrew letters ר and ד.

[58]"Ueber Kedorlaomer." in the *Theologisch Studien und Kritiken*, 1871, p. 509-512.

[59]Apud Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes etc.*, vol. i, p. 482.

[60]*Ricerche per lo studio dell antichita Assira*, Firenze, 1875, p. 205.

[61]*Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. ii, pl. 65, line 2. Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alt. Testament*, p. 160, has already pointed out that the

the second element, *Lagamar*, is the name of a well-known Elamite Deity who is mentioned by Assurbanipal, King of Assyria (668-625 B. C.), as one of the deities captured by him at Susa, the capital of Elam.[62]

In 1866 and 1868 Sir H. Rawlinson[63] and G. Smith[64] identified Chedorlaomer with Kudur-Mabug, son of Simti-Silhak and father of Rim-Sin or Eri-Aku, who was king of Yamuthbalu or Elam.[65] Oppert attacked Smith's identification[66] which was afterwards given up by Smith himself.[67] Nowadays, however, the identification of Chedorlaomer and Kudur-Mabug is set aside by all Assyriologists, except Halévy[68] followed by Vigouroux,[69] and a few others. Halévy finds it easy to make Kudur-Kabug-Kudur-Lagamar, for he says that "everything invites us to read, as G. Smith did, Lagamar instead of Mabug,"[70] adding that he hopes that some day the equation Ma-

Kudur in the name of Chedorlaomer appears also in the name of the well-known Babylonian king Nabu-Kudur-Ussur, or Nebuchadnezzar.

[62] *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. v, plate 6, line 33; G. Smith, *History of Assurbanipal*, London, 1871, p. 228; Oppert, *Records of the Past*, vol. vii, p. 82; and Delitzsch and Muss-Arnolt's Assyrian Dictionaries, *sub voce*. The name of this deity is also mentioned in the inscriptions of Anzan-Shushinak; cf. F. H. Weissbach, "Anzanische Inschriften," in the *Abhandlungen der phil-hist. classeder Kaisarische Sachs. Gessellschaft der Wissenschaft*, vol. xii, Leipzig, 1891, p. 125; Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. i, p. 390; and the article "Chedorlaomer" (by Tiele-Klostern) in Dr. Cheyne's *Encyclopedia Biblica*.

[63] Apud Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light, etc.*, p. 222. The name of Kudur-Mabug was erroneously read by Rawlinson as Kudur-Mapula.

[64] *Zeitzschrift für Agyptische Sprache*, 1868, p. 116.

[65] See *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. i, 3, n. 2; *Records of the Past*, vol. iii, p. 20; and Schrader, *Keilincshriftliche Bibliothek*, vol. iii, part i, p. 92. In his inscriptions and in those of his son Eriaku, Kudurmabug is also styled "King of Martu," which does not refer in this case to the West-Land or Canaan, but to the West of Elam. See I. Price, *Some Literary Remains of Rim-Sin (Arioch), King of Larsa, about* 2285 *B. C.*, Chicago, 1904, p. 4; and *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* vol. v, No. xvi, 1, 10, and vol. ii No. iii, 1, 4.

[66] *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1871, p. 511.

[67] *Early History of Babylonia*, London, 1873. In vol. iii, of *Records of the Past*, p. 19, however, the same distinguished Assyriologist of the British Museum adds that "The inscriptions of the period of Kudur-Mabug recall to mind the account in Genesis xiv of Chedorlaomer, who ruled from Elam to the Mediterranean. The name of Chedorlaomer in Babylonian would be Kudur-Lagamar. The early Babylonian inscriptions confirm the statements of Genesis as to the power and importance of Elam at this period." Cf. Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, loc. cit. and Brunengo, S. J., *L'Impero di Babilonia e di Ninive*, Prato, 1885, vol. i, p. 256-258, who quotes J. Ménant as opposing Smith's identification.

[68] *Recherches Bibliques*, 1885, vol. i, pp. 343, 344.

[69] *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 485 ff.

[70] *op. cit.*, p. 343.

bu-ug=la-ga-ma-ru will be found in some cuneiform lexicographical tablet, or in some bilingual text.[71]

Such was the state of the controversy up to 1894-5, when at the Church Congress, held at Norwich, England, it was announced that some Babylonian tablets had been discovered in which the three names of Chedorlaomer, Arioch and Tidal, under the form of Kudur-lagamar, Eri-Aku and Tudkhula or Tudkhal, were inscribed. But the mutilated condition of the tablets was such that the reading of the names was called in question, and for a while abandoned. But, as Dr. Pinches informs us, "when two of the tablets were referred to at the Congress of Orientalists, held at Geneva in 1894, as containing the names of Tudkḫula, Eri-Aku (Eri-Ekua), and another name read doubtfully as Kudur-lack-(gu)-mal, no publicly-expressed objection to their possible identification with Tidal, Arioch and Chedorlaomer was made. The names were placed before the Semitic section of this Congress of Orientalists as recent discoveries, which were certain as far as they went, their identification being a matter of opinion."[72] In the meanwhile the three names in question were carefully copied by Dr. Pinches, of the British Museum, and sent to Dr. Eberhard Schrader, the veteran Assyriologist of Berlin, who made them the subject of a very elaborate and scholarly discussion.[73] The only conclusion arrived at, even after Schrader's publication of his valuable memoir, was that, after all, the reading of the names was at least problematical. Dr. Pinches's tentative reading of the names, for he was the first discoverer and decipherer of the tablets in question, was readily accepted by Hommel, Sayce, Vigouroux and others of the same school, and, as Dr. Orr informs us, the first two scholars and Pinches still (1906) hold to the correctness of the reading,[74] while scholars like L. W. King,[75] Ball,[76] Zimmern,[77] Driver,[78] and others oppose it as at least doubtful.

[71] *op. cit.*, loc. cit. The identification of Kudur-Mabug and Chedorlaomer was also accepted by Ed. Meyer in his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, tom. i, p. 164-166; but he was combated by Tiele in his *Babylonisch-Assyrische, Geschichte* vol. i, p. 123 ff.

[72] *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Babylonia and Assyria*, London, 1903, pp. 222-223.

[73] In the *Sitzungsberichte der Koniglich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil-hist. classe*, 1895, pp. 261 ff.

[74] *The Problem of the Old Testament*, New York-London, 1906, p. 412, n. 1.

[75] *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, London, 1898, vol. i, pp. liv-lvi.

[76] *Light from the East, or the Witness of the Monuments*, London, p. 70.

[77] In the third edition of Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, Berlin, 190?, p. 486.

[78] *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 157. and *Archeology, Sacred and Profane*, pp. 44 ff.

In October, 1896, however, the distinguished Dominican Assyriologist, Father Scheil, the first decipherer of the famous Hammurabi Code of Laws, in an article entitled "Chedorlaomer in the Chaldean Inscriptions," published in the well-known *Revue Biblique*, the organ of the Dominican Biblical school at Jerusalem,[79] announced the discovery that the name of Chedorlaomer was mentioned in one of Hammurabi's letters, now in the Imperial Ottoman Museum at Constantinople. The letter was addressed to Sinidinnam, a vassal of Hammurabi whom he had restored to his throne in Larsa, after having defeated Chedorlaomer and the Elamites. According to Scheil's translation of the letter, Hammurabi gave to Sinidinnam, "as a reward for his valor in the day of the defeat of Chedorlaomer," some figures of Elamite goddesses which formed part of the spoil captured by the Babylonians from the defeated Elamites. Here is Father Scheil's translation:

"To Sinidinnam from Hammurabi: the goddesses of the land of Emutbal (Elam), I have given them to thee as a reward for thy valor on the day of the defeat of Chedorlaomer. Because the god, thy creator, is angered thereat, therefore destroy with the troops which are in thy hand their people, and may the goddesses remain uninjured in their holy places."

Scheil's discovery was immediately accepted by Sayce and Hommel and declared as one of the greatest importance. Hommel, however, gave a somewhat different reading and translation of the letter as follows:

"To Sinidinam
give the following order
from Hammurabi:
the goddesses of Emutbal,
thy mistresses,
on the day in which Kudur-luggamar
shall allow thee to return scatheless,
when they (the goddesses) are angry
with the god, thy creator,
destroy thou with the warriors
which are in thy hands
the warriors (of the enemy),
and they (the warriors) shall then
the goddesses
bring back to their abode
again scatheless."[80]

The contrast between Gen. xiv, representing Hammurabi as an ally of Chedorlaomer, the leader of the expedition, and one letter in

[79] "Chedorlahomer dans les inscriptions Chaldéennes, in" the *Revue Biblique*, 1906, vol. v, p. 600 ff.

[80] *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, London, 1897, p. 176.

which he is represented as his foe and conqueror is capable of a historically correct explanation; for we already know from Hammurabi's inscriptions that this king, in the early part of his reign, was subject to a superior Elamite ruler, but that later on he succeeded in rebelling against him and in establishing independent supremacy over Babylon, subduing at the same time other minor vassal kings and rulers of northern and southern Babylonia. Hence, Chedorlaomer's expedition against Canaan, of which Genesis xiv speaks, must have taken place prior to his defeat by Hammurabi.

A few months later, Father Scheil republished the letter in question, together with two others, in the *Recueil des travaux rélatifs a la philologie et a l'archéologie Egyptienne et Assyrienne.*[81] Father Scheil's second translation of the letter was substantially the same as his first, and in 1897, Dr. Pinches admitted the translation as substantially correct.[82] In 1898, however, Dr. L. W. King, of the British Museum, in the introduction to the first volume of his *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi,* submitted Scheil's and Hommel's translations to a very minute analysis showing their reading of the name "Chedorlaomer" to be incorrect, as it was based on a faulty copy of the original, and that what was read by Scheil, Sayce, Hommel and Pinches as Kudur-lagamar, should be read, in his opinion, Inuchsamar.

Dr. King's translation of the letter, which is substantially different from that of Scheil, Hommel and Pinches, is as follows:

> To Sinidinnam
> From Hammurabi
> The goddesses of Emuthbalim,
> which are assigned to thee,
> the troops under the command of Inuchsamar
> will bring to thee in safety.
> When they reach thee,
> with the troops that are in thy hand
> destroy the people, and
> the goddesses
> to their dwellings
> let them bring in safety.[83]

Dr. King's translation is undoubtedly more accurate and more in harmony with the context. The most probable view of the cir-

[81] Under the title "Correspondence de Hammurabi, roi de Babylone, avec Sini-dinnam, roi de Larsa, ou il est quaestion de Chodorlohomer." vol, xix, p. 40 ff.

[82] In the *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute,* vol. xxix, 1897, p. 69-72; and *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology,* 1898, vol. xx, p. 150 f.

[83] *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi,* vol. i, p. xxxvi.

cumstances under which the letter was written, is as follows: "Hammurabi's forces, possibly under the command of Inuchsamar, have secured a victory over Elam and have carried off a number of images of Elamite goddesses among the spoil. Inuchsamar has reported his success to Hammurabi at Babylon, and the king immediately writes a letter to Sinidinnam, who is in command of another section of the Babylonian army, and is posted on the Elamite frontier. Hammurabi does not wish to retain the goddesses in Babylonia, but is anxious to restore them to their shrines. He will not, however, merely hand them back to the Elamites, for that would be interpreted as an indication of fear, or as an admission of weakness. They must be restored to their shrines by his own people, and to do this it is necessary for Sinidinnam to enter Elamite territory, to overcome any opposition which may be offered to him, and to superintend their restoration in person. The advantage of this plan is obvious, for, while securing the favor of the goddesses by restoring them to their shrines, he, at the same time, would impress his authority on the Elamites in a most practical manner."[84]

Father Scheil's sensational discovery was thus reduced to a faulty reading of a faulty copy, and the controversy has since then peacefully rested. As to the seven fragmentary tablets in which, according to Pinches, Schrader, Sayce, Hommel and others, the names of Eri-Aku, Tudkhula and Kudurlagamar occur, and which seem to refer to events contemporary to Hammurabi's reign and period, we must be here contented with quoting only the few lines in which the three names in question are supposed to occur. They are as follows:[85]

I. "In their faithful counsel (the gods) to Kudur-lachgumal, King of the land of Elam . . . said "Descend." The King which unto them was good (he performed, and) he exercised sovereignty in Babylon, the city of Kar-Dunias." . . .

II. " . . . by force of arms he overthrew Dur-sir-ilani, son of Eri-Aku. . . ."

III. " . . . and small he cut off. Tu-ud-chul-a (or Tudkhula) son of Gazza. . . ."

IV. " . . . Ku-ku-ku-Mal his son with the iron dagger of his waist his heart he . . . "

V. "Through their sure counsel to Ku-ku-ku-ku-Mal, King of Ela (m) . . ."

---

[84]L. W. King, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvii.

[85]See Pinches, *op. cit.*, p. 224 ff; King, *op. cit.*, pp. li-lii; Ball, *op. cit.*, p. 79; Driver, *Genesis*, 157, etc.

VI. " . . . Dur-sir-ilani, son of Eri-e-ku-a- who the spoil . . . on the throne of the Kingdom sat and . . "

VII. "Who is Ku-ku-ku-ku . . . (Mal.), the doer of evil?"

Before accepting the above readings as final, and before concluding as to the identity of the three names with those of Chedorlaomer, Arioch, and Tidal of Genesis xiv, the following considerations are to be carefully borne in mind:

I. That our fragments do not date from a period earlier than that of the Persian period, i. e., about the fourth century B. C., and hence, even supposing the correctness of the reading of the names, they may not refer to the kings of Genesis xiv, unless the tablets in question can be shown to be copies of much earlier texts of the Hammurabi period, which may be possible but is not certain, nor even probable.

II. Tudkhula and Eriaku in the above tablets are not said to be either Kings or sons of Kings, while Tidal and Arioch of Genesis xiv are positively stated to be Kings of Goyim and Ellasar respectively.

III. As to the names of Chedorlaomer, which appears in the above tablets under the form of Kukukumal and Kukukukumal, (which is, according to Pinches, Hommel and Sayce, a fanciful writing of the name Kudurlagamar) it must be admitted that the cuneiform signs for *Ku* has the value both of *Ku* and *dur*, so that, *Ku-dur* being, a well known component of Elamite names, we can safely read the name in question as Ku-dur-ku-mal. Pinches, however, suggests that the same cuneiform sign for *Ku* and *dur* has also the value of *lach* or *la'g*, hence the name can be read Ku-dur-la'g-mal=Ku-dur-lag-gu-mal=Ku-dur-lag-gu-mar, which is, indeed, identical with Chedorlaomer and Chedollogomor. But, even supposing the correctness of the reading, and even accepting Pinches' hypothesis that the sign for *Ku* has also the value of *lag*, and although the person in question is explicitly called "King of Elam," as Chedorlaomer was, nevertheless it can not be shown that he is the same personage as Chedorlaomer of Genesis xiv, and the contemporary of Hammurabi and Abraham.[86]

GABRIEL OUSSANI.

[86] Cf. King. *op. cit.*, p. lv.

NOTES.

Few recent works on theological topics have attracted as keen nd widespread interest throughout the Church as Father Christian Pesch's volume *De Inspiratione Sacræ Scripturæ*. It has already been reviewed at length in a large number of Catholic periodicals, and we may be sure that others are preparing careful studies of it to appear in future issues. From the reviews of it already published we select certain passages which will give some indication of how it has been received. On certain points, it may be remarked, the opinion of the reviewers is unanimous—they unite in lauding the painstaking scholarship of the author, and also his honesty and courtesy when it falls to him to criticize views held by Catholic writers with whom he does not agree.

We have already quoted (N. Y. R., vol. ii, p. 110) the grateful testimony of Father Lagrange on the latter point. We now present similar witness from a scholar who belongs to the same great religious society of which Father Pesch is a member, but whose judgment (as other parts of his criticisms show) is no way biased by that fact. In the course of a long review of the book in the *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* (June, 1906), Father A. Durand, S. J., now of Canterbury, quotes certain passages from articles by Father Pesch in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, which passages go to show the calm and breadth of their writer's mind. For instance: "The Catholic critics . . . hold firmly to the supernatural origin of Holy Scripture. They admit that all Scripture is inspired, that the truth of every proposition taught by the sacred writer is guaranteed by God. Only they wish to distinguish carefully between what the sacred writers affirm as true, and what they have used only as a literary dress without wishing to give it the character of teaching. No dogmatic principle is here at stake." And again, on the right tone of domestic controversy: "Every man has a right to defend his assertions by the aid of reason . . . but it belongs to the Church alone to pronounce theological censures. Personal attacks, mere declamation, rhetorical flights: these are matters all the more to be avoided since there is already enough over-excitement, and they can be nothing but hurtful to the quest of truth and to science. . . . In scientific disputes, words, big though they be, are but blows in the air; solid reasons alone are of lasting avail."

Commenting on these passages Fr. Durand says: "These are no mere empty declarations. From first to last of his book, the author remains faithful to the principles which he here lays down. He has eyes to see; and he wants to understand, and to understand thoroughly, what others have said, and the reasons why they said it. He endeavors to enter with sympathy into the thoughts of others, even of those whom he intends to refute. In criticizing them, he proceeds

with moderation, as is becoming in a theologian discussing questions with other theologians. He never loses sight of the fact that many of his opponents are Catholic scholars worthy of esteem, who are fallible no doubt, but who have the right to be refuted seriously, by theological or critical arguments, without having suspicion cast on the sincerity of their faith or their devotion to the Church. And these scholars are the first to acknowledge the faithful and courteous treatment which Father Pesch accords them."

To the *Irish Theological Quarterly* Dr.MacRory contributes an article entitled "Father Pesch on inspiration." He expresses himself as being grateful to the author, especially for his "excellent history of the doctrine of inspiration." He gives a careful and appreciative exposition of Father Pesch's theory of inspiration. Most of the article is devoted to the question of inerrancy, and the writer takes occasion to express his own views in agreement or disagreement with those of Father Pesch. Concerning the agreement drawn from the Fathers in favor of the historicity of certain books which many moderns regard as works of religious fiction, he says: "In my opinion, there is no authoritative Patristic interpretation. Not many of the Fathers have dealt at all with the books in question—Ruth, Tobias, Judith, Esther, and II Machabees—and even if they had, we may take it that their view would not be binding upon us, provided that there is no question of faith or morals involved." So, too, in dealing with the question of the presence of legendary elements in historical books, he says: "That Scripture can teach no error is a matter of dogma, which the Fathers seem unanimous in regarding as of Catholic faith—and here there is an obligation of faith to accept their teaching; but that each and every passage of the historical books is history, is a question of exegesis, on which if they meant to pronounce at all, it may have been only as private teachers, not as witnesses to faith."

Dr. MacRory agrees with Father Pesch that in the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, Leo XIII did not intend to put Scriptural history on the same level with Scriptural astronomy, etc., when he wrote the much debated sentence: "*Hæc ipsa deinde ad cognatas disciplinas, ad historiam præsertim, juvabit transferri.*" On a further point, however, he says: "I entirely disagree with Fr. Pesch when he states (p. 538) that the Popes have frequently declared the Bible contains no myths"—since the condemnations which can be cited are aimed only at extreme and sweeping rationalistic views. The conclusion of the eminent Irish scholar is an exhortation to patience, with a word of comfort to sustain us. "The nature of inspiration is largely a new question. . . . And though at present it is everywhere the subject of earnest and patient investigation, it may still be long before all doubts and difficulties are cleared away. Meantime, relying on the authority of the Church, we can rest assured that, whatever the conclusions ultimately reached, the divine character and authority of the Bible as an inspired record of revelation will remain absolutely firm and unshaken."

The reviewer in the *Revue Augustinienne* (April, 1906), is Seraphin Protin. He speaks of the work as being distinguished "like all the other

works of Father Pesch, by a certain abundance, the citations being numerous and sometimes very lengthy." It is "a veritable encyclopedia of theories of inspiration." In criticism of the author's position, he says: "As for verbal inspiration, I grant that St. Thomas has not expressed it in proper terms, but his view has been clear enough to be embraced by the whole Thomistic school, and in their wake, by a number of moderns. And when Father Brucker speaks with disdain of 'belated partisans of verbal inspiration,' he does not sufficiently consider that these 'belated' ones form a legion which is daily increasing in numbers. And we may ask whether the freedom which they claim to confer upon exegesis by relieving it of verbal inspiration, is a sufficient, or even an important aid in solving the difficulties raised by science, history, and criticism." The reviewer also compares, with quiet humor, the different attitudes taken by Father Pesch and Father Schiffini towards two of their confreres, Father von Hummelauer on the one hand, and Father Delattre on the other: "But, is it simply distraction? Father Pesch seems totally to ignore Father Delattre, who, *per contra*, is in high honor with Father Schiffini." (We owe to M. Protin's selection the two following citations, one from a Spanish and the other from a Swiss periodical).

In the *Cindad de Dios* (March 5, 1906), a writer signing himself G. A., gives a general appreciation of the work. "The book just published by Father Pesch is of great usefulness for all who intend to devote themselves to Scripture studies, and who desire to keep themselves posted on their progress. Books and articles on biblical topics are so numerous nowadays that it is almost impossible to keep up with them. Hence, if for no other reason, a work like this, which gives a synthesis of the principal points, ought to be welcome to all. . . . Father Pesch advances his own opinion on those questions which, it is true, are not yet decided by the authority of the Church, and which are at present matters of dispute among Catholic authors; but he is always in accord with the majority of the most eminent biblical theologians. It is clear that in these questions his authority should be measured according to the value of the reasons set forth."

H. S., in the *Revue de Fribourg* (March, 1906), says: "Father Pesch gives us the most complete study which has thus far appeared, a veritable *Summa* on the question of inspiration. . . . We remark in the whole exposition a sincere desire for impartiality and objectivity. The documents of this vast enquiry are very numerous; but we would like to find, at least by way of footnotes, the original text of modern authors who wrote in their own language."

The editor of the department of Scripture in the *Messenger* (April, 1906), treats Father Pesch's book in connection with those of Father Fonck (*Der Kampf um die Wahrheit der h. Schrift seit 25 Jahren*) and of Dr. Barry (The *Tradition of Scripture*). He is generous with his praise of all three works, but he sums up his estimate of them thus: "Generally speaking, Father Fonck is conservative, Father Barry is rather progressive, Father Pesch tries to adhere to the golden mean." Concerning the work

of the latter author in particular, he expresses the opinion, in which all will agree with him: "We are not afraid to maintain that whoever wishes in future to treat of Biblical inspiration will have to reckon with Father Pesch's work." Most of the study is devoted to a discussion of the theories of inspiration, taking as a basis the views of Cardinal Franzelin and Father Lagrange. The writer adheres to the doctrine of the learned Cardinal as developed by Father Pesch.

In the course of an article on "History and Inspiration" in the *Catholic University Bulletin* for April, Dr. Poels gives a passing notice to the work of Father Pesch, mainly in so far as it bears on the topic he is treating. "Every scholar is bound to admire the great learning of this broad-minded theologian. The publication of a treatise on inspiration by Chr. Pesch is an event in the theological world." Passing to a more special consideration of the author's views, Dr. Poels says: "Pesch gives a false solution to the most important questions dealt with in his work, because he misunderstands the character of biblical history. This misapprehension is the cause of almost all the flaws in this treatise on inspiration. . . . If the learned theologian had distinguished between two kinds of history, (traditional or popular, and scientific) radically different, to be dealt with in this article, his philosophical and logical mind would not have compelled him to draw conclusions which Bible students maintain, and will always maintain, to be at variance with the facts to be accounted for by Catholic scholars. We even do not see how it would be possible to account for some facts acknowledged by Pesch himself, if we had to start from his notion or definition of history. It seems to us that, logically, from this standpoint, he ought to be more severe than he is when dealing with the theories of modern writers regarding, e. g., the historical origin of the name of Babel, p. 551, the mention of Cainan in Our Lord's genealogy, p. 547, and implicit quotations at large, pp. 515 ff. From his standpoint even the explanation of the narrative of creation, pp. 515 ff, does not seem quite satisfactory."

The review in *The Tablet* is written by a stout defender of the theory of Verbal Inspiration. He takes direct issue with Father Pesch's views: "What authority is there for making any distinction in the meaning of inspiration as applied to Scripture? The Fathers and Scholastics knew of none. The Church, defining that the Sacred Scriptures with all their parts are divinely inspired, says nothing of formal or any other kind of inspiration. So it would have to be said that the Church has most inadequately expressed herself on this vital point; for the obvious meaning, that all things in Scripture—material diction not excluded—were written under the influence of one and the same effect which is called inspiration, is, according to Father Pesch, not the true meaning of the Church; but when she speaks of inspiration, she means two different things, namely, inspiration proper, which applies to "truths," and inspiration in a limited sense, amounting to little more than a negative assistance, affecting the material composition. Whatever may have been the traditional view of inspiration current in the Church, there is certainly no patristic or scholastic authority for this "vivisection" of the word inspiration as applied to

Scripture. Would it not be better to rest content with the "assistentia divina" than to mar the simplicity of inspiration by distinctions?"

In answer to the contention that the present theory of Verbal Inspiration is "new," the writer retorts that, however this may be, the Jesuit theory is also "new." "We shall endeavor to show by a few examples that our author's own exposition of the Fathers and Schoolmen is biased by his preconceived notion of inspiration, so that the historical treatise, as it stands, might with more reason follow rather than precede the dogmatic." After instancing Father Pesch's mode of handling statements made by St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and Agobardus, the reviewer concludes: "These few examples should suffice to show that nothing short of violent exegesis will reconcile the theory of the Jesuit school with the traditional theory of the Fathers and Schoolmen, whatever that may have been. The exposition of the historical side of the question given in this volume, based as it is on a preconceived idea of inspiration, will not stand criticism. Nevertheless, the volume contains much useful matter, the chapters on the inerrancy of Scripture and on the criteria of inspiration being particularly instructive."

In conclusion, we cannot do better than to quote the paragraph with which Father Durand closes his article, especially since it embodies the broad-minded and courageous view of Father Pesch himself: "The work *De Inspiratione Scripturæ Sacræ* remains as a loyal and successful effort in the direction of fuller truth. If it does not afford a final answer to all the questions which controversy has aroused, it is because such a result is not yet possible. And this very reserve is to the author's credit. Moreover, Father Pesch is not of those who would settle everything by suppressing discussion. Here is how he faces the situation (in *Stimmen*, Feb., 1906): 'That such a combat should be raised about Holy Scripture is certainly a trying event, and one that is dangerous for many; but it is also a proof that ecclesiastical science is neither dead nor sleeping. Where there is struggle there is life. Since all of the theologians await with entire confidence the doctrinal decisions of the Church, and are ready to submit to them with an obdience which is sure of itself beforehand, the result of this struggle will undoubtedly be to throw more light on Biblical questions, to give a better understanding of them, and to inspire an increasing consideration and an ever more diligent study of Holy Scripture. This result is worth being bought at the price of certain unpleasant consequences and even of some danger."

"To the following doubts proposed to the Pontifical Commission on Biblical Studies, the following answers have been given:[1]

Propositis sequentibus dubiis Consilium Pontificium pro studiis de re biblica povehendis respondendum censuit prout sequitur:

I. Utrum argumenta a criticis congesta ad impugnandam authentiam Mosaicam sacrorum Librorum, qui Pentateuchi nomine designantur, tanti sint ponderis, ut posthabitis quampluribus testimoniis utriusque Testamenti collective sumptis, perpetua consensione populi Iudaici, Ecclesiæ quoque constanti traditione nec non

"1. Whether the arguments amassed by critics to impugn the Mosaic authenticity of the Sacred Books known as the Pentateuch are of sufficient weight, notwithstanding the very many evidences to the contrary contained in both Testaments taken collectively, the perpetual agreement of the Hebrew people, and the constant tradition of the Church as well as the proofs furnished by internal criticism of the text, to justify the statement that these books have not Moses for their author, but have been compiled from sources for the most part posterior to the time of Moses?

"Answer: No.

"2. Whether the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch necessarily postulates a redaction of the whole work in the sense that it must be absolutely held that Moses wrote with his own hand or dictated to amanuenses all and everything contained in it; or whether it is possible to admit the hypothesis of those who think that Moses conceived the work under the influence of divine inspiration, and then entrusted the writing of it to some other person or persons, but in such manner that they faithfully rendered his meaning, wrote nothing contrary to his will, and omitted nothing; and that the work thus formed, approved by Moses, as the principal and inspired author was made public under his name?

---

indiciis internis quæ ex ipso textu eruntuur, ius tribuant affirmandi hos libros non Moysen habere auctorem, sed ex fontibus maxima ex parte aetate Mosaica posterioribus esse confectos?

Resp. Negative.

II. Utrum Mosaica authentia Pentateuchi talem necessario postulet redactionem totius operis, ut prorsus tenendum sit Moysen omnia et singular manu sua scripsisse vel amanuensibus dictasse; an etiam eorum hypothesis permitti possit qui existimant eum opus ipsum a se sub divinæ inspirationis afflatu conceptum alteri vel pluribus scribendum commisisse, ita tamen ut sensa sua fideliter redderent, nihil contra suam voluntatem scriberent, nihil omitterent; ac tandem opus hac ratione confectum, ab eodem Moyse principe inspiratoque auctore probatum, ipsiusmet nomine vulgaretur?

Rep. Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

III. Utrum absque præiudicio Mosaicæ authentiæ Pentateuchi concedi possit Moysen ad suum conficiendum opus fontes adhibuisse, scripta videlicet documenta vel orales traditiones, ex quibus, secundum peculiarem scopum sibi propositum et sub divinæ inspirationis afflatu, nonnulla hauserit eaque ad verbum vel quoad sententiam, contracta vel amplificata, ipsi operi inseruerit?

Resp. Affirmative.

IV. Utrum, salva substantialiter Mosaica authentia et integritate Pentateuchi, admitti possit tam longo sæculorum decursu nonnullas ei modificationes obvenisse, uti: additamenta post Moysi mortem vel ab auctore inspirato apposita, vel glossas et explicationes textui interiectas; vocabula quædam et formas e sermone antiquato in sermonem recentiorem translatas; mendosas demum lectiones vitio amanuensium adscribendas, de quibus fas sit ad normas artis criticæ disquirere et iudicare?

Resp. Affirmative, salvo Ecclesiæ iudicio.

Die autem 27 junii an. 1906, in Audientia Rmis Consultoribus ab Actis benigne concessa Sanctissimus prædicta Responsa adprobavit ac publici juris fieri mandavit.

Fulcranus G. Vigouroux, P. S. S.
Laurentius Janssens, O. S. B.
Consultores ab Actis.

Answer: "No, to the first; yes, to the second.

"3. Whether it can be conceded, without prejudice to the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch, that Moses in his work used sources. i. e., written documents or oral traditions, from which to suit his special purpose and under the influence of divine inspiration, he selected some things and inserted them in his own work, either literally or in substance, summarised or amplified?

"Answer: Yes.

"4. Whether granted the substantial Mosaic authenticity and the integrity of the Pentateuch, it may be admitted that in the long course of ages some modifications have been introduced into it, such as additions after the death of Moses, either inserted by an inspired author or attached to the text as glosses or interpretations; words and forms translated from the ancient language to more recent language: and, finally, faulty readings to be ascribed to the error of copyists, concerning which it is lawful to investigate and judge according to the laws of criticism.

"Answer: Yes; due regard being paid to the judgment of the Church."

"The secretaries having reported as above to His Holiness on June 27, 1906, His Holiness approved the foregoing answers, and ordered the publication of them."

"Fulcranus Vigoruoux, P. S. S.,
"P. Laurentius Janssens, O. S. B.,
Secretaries.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Lex Credendi: A Sequel to Lex Orandi—by GEORGE TYRRELL, New York, London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1906. Pp. xvi, 256. Bombay, Longmans, Green & Co.

Father Tyrrell's *Lex Orandi* was an attempt to vindicate the Christian faith before a world disposed to make much of conduct and little of theology. Assuming that when the beliefs expressed in a creed, constantly and universally tend to promote the religious development of the race and the individual, they may fairly be considered as representative of spiritual realities, he drew attention to the theoretical and practical efficacy of the Christian revelation for the perfecting of moral conduct; and justified the notions and views underlying Catholic dogmatic formularies on the ground that they have shown themselves to be seeds of true holiness and have provided nourishment which seems indispensable for the maintaining of that attitude toward life which is commonly known as "Christian."

In treating of the connection between dogma and spiritual development, *Lex Orandi* assumed that the term "spirit of Christ" had a value familiar to all, or at least easily determinable. For the proper enlightment of the reader however, it was necessary to attempt an explanation and more exact description of this concept. Such an explanation is attempted in *Lex Credendi*. Devotional rather than theological in character, it touches on points more fundamental than those considered in the earlier work, the assimilation of Christ's spirit being a more vital process than the defense of particular articles of faith. Far above all other questions in importance is this: "Have I the spirit of Christ?" If that can be answered affirmatively, then the soul is safe, no matter what confusion may occur in things of the intellect: for to have put on the spirit of Christ is to be in a condition essentially incompatible with anything like real unfaith or formal sin. It is with a matter of tremendous import and of universal interest then, that Father Tyrrell is concerned in his latest work.

In the first part of the volume, the author describes what he understands by "the spirit of Christ"—His feeling toward God and man all creation—the total response of His spiritual being to the

Divine Reality by which it is encompassed and in which it is rooted, a response that is at once vision, feeling and will. Our chief concern in life is to appropriate this spirit in the measure of our capacity, to believe, trust and love Christ not in any merely human way, but as the embodiment of the divine Will, of the cause for which He lived and died, of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. Sentimentalism is one danger we must keep clear of; it "is possible to have a tender love of every feature of Christ's Sacred Humanity, and yet never to have thought or felt with the spirit of Christ." Mysticality is another danger; it concentrates the soul wholly or principally on the metaphysics of Christ's being, and not on that aspect of it on which He wishes us chiefly to concentrate ourselves, not on His life, His spirit, His way. And Practicality is a third danger; it regards Christ merely as the incarnation of right conduct in a narrow sense, sundering the interests of truth and beauty from those of righteousness, laying value on the outward manifestation rather than on the immanent spiritual reality of goodness, ignoring the mystical depth of divine love and its implication of a supernatural world beyond the little sphere of our clear vision and separated from it by that band of twilight in which the mystic loves to linger. If Christ's spirit was practical it was certainly not utilitarian. If it disdained faith without works, it also disdained works without faith. His love was active, His action loving, and both were penetrated by the light of truth. In the Gospels Christ lives for us as the classical manifestation of the highest human life. Christ's perfect humanity has revealed to us as much of the Father as we can ever imaginatively realize, love or deal with; He has translated the divine life into terms of human life; and every human ideal (even the *Uebermensch*) so long as it contains any admixture of heavenly gold may be sought for, pure and unalloyed, in the ideal manhood of Christ.

The second part of the volume is twice as large as the first. In it the author's desire to portray the Gospel conception of Perfect Manhood leads him "to try to apprehend the spirit of Christ just as it breathes itself forth in that prayer whose words He has adopted, but whose sense and inspiration (of which they are the vehicle) are all His own, and can only be determined in the light of all His teaching and action." This prayer of Christ is at once the deepest and most succinct expression of the spirit and life of Christ, of that life whose reproduction in ourselves is the criterion of our religious beliefs and institutions. It is the norm of all pure prayer and indirectly of all

pure belief; it is at once the *Lex Credendi* and the *Lex Orandi.* The *Credo* is but the explicitation of what is latent in the *Pater Noster.*"

So we are presented with a series of studies on the Lord's Prayer, a series which forms a very precious addition to the literature of spiritual teaching. The field is one in which Father Tyrrell has achieved an acknowledged mastery—we might say supremacy, so far as contemporaries are concerned. Who else writes on the problems of the spiritual life with so wide a view, so sure an analysis, so sincere an exposition, so attractive a style! Such qualities indeed, have become practically identified with his name; and the multitude who thank him for their first introduction to sane, vigorous, wholesome, honest, noble, practical ideals of religion are neither injured nor disturbed if they meet passages in which only an expert could discover the opportunity for damaging misinterpretation. A clear exposure of current misconceptions, a convincing criticism of certain more or less tolerated dishonesties, an irresistible recommendation of the purest and most unselfish principles of conduct—these we encounter again and again, as we read. To find them here awakens no surprise to be sure, but it does impress and delight and inspire. Few vigilant observers of men will deny that the author bears hard upon the falsifications and distortions of religion which work most harm to-day. Few minds will remain unenlightened by his image of Christliness, so vivid and so true. Few consciences will not be strengthened in the battle with self by the motives which he urges for responding enthusiastically to the summons of the spirit of Christ.

Lex Credendi may be, or rather is, viewed from many standpoints and made the subject of widely varying comments. Neither its author, nor its most fervent admirer would venture to declare it beyond the reach of criticism or the possible need of emendation. But he will be a short-sighted reader who does not find within these pages much precious substance of truth; and he must be but ill acquainted with the signs of the times who is not aware that the Church has suffered egregiously from the dearth of just such instruction as this book bestows.

Father Tyrrell and his writings have attracted so much attention in the theological world that it is inevitable this present work should to a great extent be judged in the light of prepossessions originated by recent controversy. Viewed with a suspicious eye and from the standpoint of assumptions which he has practically disallowed, the author will very probably be challenged for more than one passage

in *Lex Credendi*. Possibly it would be his wish to have these pages considered as the flower and fruit of such principles or methods as he has publicly declared his own. So regarded, they constitute indeed no inconsiderable argument for the general soundness of his philosophy. But apart from all that, and waving all question of "Pragmatism," or "New Apologetics," or "Method of Immanence," the volume has an undoubted spiritual value for every thinking man; and it is to be hoped that readers will attend mainly to this quality and accord the writer his due for help given so generously and at so critical a time. The respective merits of the older and the newer theological method we may well be unable to determine without great detriment to our soul's welfare; but to examine suspiciously, or hastily censure, or loftily scorn, the lessons and inspirations of this very timely work, may mean that we are both quenching the flame of love within our own souls and turning the steps of others away from the Kingdom of God.

In *The Tablet*, *The Month*, *The Ecclesiastical Review*, *The Messenger*, *The Catholic World*, *The Dublin Review*, and *The Irish Theological Quarterly*, notices of the new book have appeared which place its importance beyond question; and on the whole, it is very encouraging, as well as significant, to note the terms which these various reviews employ. At least they will suffice to make discriminating readers look into the volume; and few such will close it before finding good reasons of their own to regard it as well worth having in the library.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY.

Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament—by REV. FRANCIS E. GIGOT, D. D. Part II. Didactic and Prophetical Writings. pp. 505. New York, Benziger Brothers. 1906.

With the present volume Dr. Gigot completes his *Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament*. The author deals with the historical and literary problems which are suggested by the scientific study of the Sacred Books of the Old Covenant, authorship, date, purpose, contents, literary structure, etc. The work is intended for the use of Biblical students of whom is expected a close acquaintance with the leading questions relative to the writings of the Old Testament. Dr. Gigot follows the same plan as in the first part: "He is satisfied with giving the arguments *for* or *against* the views which he has set forth" and "thus he leaves full liberty to the teacher

who will use the present work as a text-book, to pronounce himself in favor of the view on the side of which evidence seems to him to be preponderant." This impersonal and objective method has enabled Dr. Gigot to be perfectly fair and honest. This fairness of exposition is a feature of the work for which we are thankful. In similar works, conservative or not, arguments or portions of arguments with which authors are not in sympathy, are too often reduced to misleading and inadequate formulas, if not omitted entirely. In this respect, the present work shows an immense progress. In order to be convinced of this fact, let the reader compare—to give an example selected almost at random—Dr. Gigot's exposition of the modern theories with regard to the Deutero-Isaias (pp. 249 ff.) or Daniel (pp. 347 ff.) with Cornely's treatment of the same, *Introductio*, etc., II, ii, pp. 341 ff; 495 ff, or Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique*, II, pp. 491 ff, 607 ff. Of course, in so short a space, Father Gigot could not have entered into all the details of the arguments; his book supposes a professor to complete, develop, and further criticize the ideas which he brings forth; we are sure that this is the author's desire; otherwise, the student would not always be able to appreciate correctly some of the reasons advanced; besides, although the student must know what is said by the various schools, it is more important still that he should be initiated into the working of the proper methods and be taught how to pass a judgment of his own in presence of the conflicting evidence. All this is the task of the teacher; let us hope, however, that Dr. Gigot himself will soon be able to give us a little monograph on some of the books in which the various aspects will be not only exposed but criticized, rejected or accepted as the case may be; this will serve as a model both to the professor in his teaching and to the pupil in his further studies. None is better prepared than the learned author to undertake the work.

Another feature which we cannot praise too much, and which, in our opinion, makes this second part even superior to the first, is the space allowed to the examination of the present texts in comparison with the original. Doctor Gigot rightly thinks that it is of prime importance to make the student realize the fundamental necessity of Textual Criticism in all scientific investigations. Too many begin literary and historical criticism without being sufficiently equipped with the means of controlling the texts that are used. In practice, Textual Criticism is often a difficult and tedious task, one which cannot be expected from the average student of our seminaries; but

what every one can and should know, is the necessity of the work, *as a method.* No one, even in the ordinary ministry, should be unaware that the texts of some books are in some particulars seriously doubtful, v. g., Job, Jeremias, Proverbs, Ezechiel, etc. Besides, Textual methods will often decide whether any given portion of a book is original or not, and thus will greatly help in the solution of the problems concerning the literary structure and the phases through which the books have passed before assuming their present form.

As announced in the preface, Doctor Gigot has generally refrained from giving us his own preferences, and sometimes it is hard to know what is his personal opinion. Occasionally, however, he has followed a different course; in those few instances, we must admire his great moderation which contrasts strongly with the assertive tendencies of some modern authors. In fact, we find him occasionally too moderate. Any one who will read Prof. Van Hoonacker's contribution to the study of the Book of Job (*Revue Biblique,* 1903, pp. 161 ff), or even any of the works to which Dr. Gigot refers, will hardly be satisfied with dubitative way in which he sums up the evidence concerning the speeches of Eliu, p. 46. Again, that Isaias i-xxxv contains portions not ascribable to the prophet himself is much more probable than the author would lead us to infer, pp. 214 ff. To give one more example: the guarded way in which he speaks of the late composition of Daniel, will be considered by many as minimizing the results; in this connection, he might have insisted a little more on the difference between the apocalyptic literary method and real prophecy, in order to explain the difficulty mentioned, p. 376. (Cf. Lagrange, *Revue Biblique,* 1904, 494 ff).

We note also with great satisfaction the absence of *innuendos* with regard to the subjective motives of the authors mentioned. We are so used to hear appeals made to theological bias, party spirit, rationalistic tendencies or superstitious prejudices, etc., that it is really refreshing to see such an objective consideration of the different sides as the one given by Father Gigot. In a scientific investigation, especially when intended for the intellectual formation of our students, we must take the arguments for what they are worth, whatever may have been the motives that prompted them.

We cannot enter into a detailed analysis, of the various books, as they are treated by Doctor Gigot. Occasionally, the work would require some little additions, especially with regard to shades of differences within the same main opinion; as a rule, however, the student

will find the information desired in the well-chosen bibliography to which he refers. To state briefly our impressions on the present work, we would say that Doctor Gigot is well informed, up-to-date (Cf. especially Ecclesiaticus), fair and moderate; his method is objective and impersonal. All these qualities added to a clear and pleasing style make this Introduction, in many respects, an ideal text-book; if properly interpreted by a conscientious professor, it will render immense service, and will contribute powerfully to the advancement of the scientific study of the Bible. We feel confident that if worth counts, it will have at least as great a success as the former volumes issued from the learned author's pen. It is a pleasure for us to note that, in their Catalogue for the coming year, (p. 25) the Sulpitian Fathers of Baltimore have already entered the work as a text-book of Sacred Scripture; this, if nothing else, is a sufficient guarantee of the real merits as well as of the reliableness of Doctor Gigot's scholarly achievement.

Let us hope that the author will add another claim to our gratitude by giving us, as is his intention (p. 6), a Special Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament; thus, we shall be supplied with a complete series of up-to-date works introductory to the Sacred Scriptures.

ROMAIN BUTIN, S. M.

Le Livre d'Hénoch, traduit sur le Texte Ethiopien—par FRANÇOIS MARTIN. Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1906; pp. clii-319.

This is the first volume of an important series to whose forthcoming publication the NEW YORK REVIEW recently called the attention of its readers. (See vol. i, p. 511). The series is meant to supply the general public with thoroughly reliable works preparatory to the scientific study of Holy Writ, under the title of "Documents pour l'Etude de la Bible." And the present volume is by the leading editor of the series, the Abbé François Martin, the distinguished professor of Semitic languages in the Catholic Institute of Paris. It is a remarkable study on the text and contents of the apocryphal Book of Henoch, the importance of which is paramount for the understanding of the conceptions of the Jews shortly before the Christian era, and consequently also for the interpretation of the sacred writings of the New Testament.

The volume opens with a valuable "Introduction" (pp. xv-clii) which gives (1) the Analysis of the Book of Henoch; (2) its Doctrinal

Contents; (3) the History of its Transmission; (4) the Literature concerning the Book of Henoch. According to Dr. Martin, the Book of Henoch comprises besides an Introductory Part (chaps. i-v), and an Appendix (chaps. cvi-cviii), five leading sections as follows: I. The Fall of Angels and Assumption of Henoch (chaps. vi-xxxvi); II. The Book of Parables (chaps. xxxvii-lxxi); III. The Book of the Heavenly Luminaries (chaps. lxxii-lxxxii); IV. The Book of Dreams (chaps. lxxxiii-xc); V. The Book of the Exhortation and the Malediction (chaps. xci-cv). This division is, in some respects, a novel one, but it undoubtedly rests on an independent and thorough examination of that apocryphal work. As regards the Doctrinal Contents of the various sections, the learned editor insists particularly on those topics which have a direct bearing on the Theology of the New Testament. He deals with Henoch's conceptions of God's names and attributes, the world and its visible and invisible elements, the angels, demons and satans, man and the origin of sin, the last things (the abode of the departed souls, the resurrection, the Messias, the judgment, hell, and the kingdom). He sets forth these conceptions in a brief but masterly manner; the references to the various sections and the distinct passages are carefully given, and the exposition of the doctrines is that of a scholar who most conscientiously avoids reading into the text of the Book of Henoch, the ideas and teachings of a later date.

Equally careful and thorough is the chapter wherein Fr. Martin sketches the history of the Book of Henoch. We do not possess the original text of that apocryphal writing, and it is only by a comparison of the incomplete translations of it which have come down to us that the learned editor is led to recognize Hebrew as the language in which it was originally written, and to determine the respective value of its Latin, Ethiopic, and Greek Versions. When he admits that the Book of Henoch is a compilation made up of literary remains which reflect the distinct and conflicting traditions of the Jews concerning Henoch, and also Noe, Fr. Martin is decidedly right, for as was well said by an earlier editor of that apocryphal work, R. H. Charles (The Book of Enoch, p. viii): "In the Book of Enoch we have a typical example of the Oriental method of editing. Less important books were constantly rescued from oblivion by incorporation in larger books. Plagiarism and literary property were ideas alike foreign to the Palestinian consciousness of the time. As the name of David attracted different collections of the Psalms, and the name of Solomon successive collections

of proverbs, so the name of Enoch attracted various treatments of celestial and terrestrial phenomena as well as of the problem of the suffering righteous." Fr. Martin is likewise right, when in agreement with most contemporary scholars, he assigns a pre-Christian date to the redaction of the Book of Henoch, and admits that the authors of its various parts lived at different times between "the second third of the second century, and 64 B. C." (p. xciv). According to him the authors were mostly Pharisees, intense nationalists, who, however, underwent in several ways the influence of foreign, chiefly Babylonian and Egyptian, conceptions (pp. xcix-cx).

Having thus described the origin of the Book of Henoch, the Abbé Martin proceeds to point out the use which has been made of that famous work in the course of ages. He briefly shows its influence on such Jewish works as the Book of Jubilees (ab. 135 A. D.), the Apocalypse of Baruch (soon after 70 A. D.), the fourth Book of Esdras (ab. 95 A. D.), the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (1st cent. A. D.); etc. He next admits that it was quoted by St. Jude (verses 14, 15) and thoroughly known to the other writers of the New Testament as shown by the leading passages from both Henoch and the New Testament which he quotes in parallel columns (pp. cxiii-cxxii). And lastly he points out the traces more or less distinct left by the Book of Henoch in Patristic and subsequent Christian literature, together with the finds of its various parts which have been made down to 1893 (pp. cxxii-cxxxix).

The Introduction concludes with an exhaustive Bibliography which chronicles the Editions and Translations of the Book of Henoch, as also the numerous Essays, Articles, etc., which bear directly or indirectly on the contents, text, and teachings of that apocryphal work (pp. cxli-cli).

The body of Fr. Martin's edition (pp. 1-287) is naturally taken up with the translation of the Book of Henoch. This translation is made directly from Flemming's Ethiopic edition (Leipsig, 1902), and is the result of thorough scholarship and sound criticism. The reader can at a glance recognize the additions or suppressions advocated by the learned translator, and he finds in the footnotes all useful references to Scriptural and Patristic literature, as well as a clear summary of the recent discussions anent the meaning, various readings, etc., of the text of the Book of Henoch.

To make his edition more complete and useful, Dr. Martin subjoins four Indices prepared with the greatest care. The first is an alpha-

betical index of topics (pp. 289-303). Next comes an index of Scriptural passages from both the Old and the New Testaments (pp. 304-311), followed by a shorter, but valuable index of passages from the Apocryphal or Pseudepigraphic writings. And the whole work closes with a summary of the contents of Fr. Martin's work.

It would be difficult to imagine a more painstaking and complete edition of any ancient writing. From beginning to end, the best and latest methods of literary and historical criticism are applied to the most varied topics. No piece of evidence of any account has been ignored by the learned editor. Hence without perhaps being final, Fr. Martin's edition of the Book of Henoch is decidedly the best as yet published. It presages well indeed for the subsequent works which, under his leadership, other able scholars have promised to the public under the title of "Documents pour l' Etude de la Bible."

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

The Law of the Church—A Cyclopaedia of Canon Law for English-speaking Countries by ETHELRED TAUNTON, priest of the Archdiocese of Westminster. Kegan Paul, Trench, etc. London. Herder, St. Louis.

The purpose of this work is best stated in the author's own words: "My aim has been throughout to provide a practical work upon the canon law with special reference to English speaking countries. Questions which more directly concern dogma, liturgy, morals and ceremonial are passed over; also all questions concerning regulars, except where they come into contact directly or indirectly with the episcopal authority. Much of this book may be found in the many volumes of the *Bibliotheca Canonica, Juridica, Moralis, Theological necnon Ascetica, Polemica, Rubristica, Historica* of Ferraris, a work which, appearing first about the middle of the eighteenth century, has received so many additions from various hands, that, so to say, it has become difficult to see the wood on account of the trees. I have also put most of the later and modern-day writers under direct contributions; I have also attempted to keep pace with the latest decisions. It is also well to point out clearly that I first treat of the Common Law on each point; and then give the particular Law which will sometimes be found to modify the former. * * * * It now remains to offer respectfully this book, the first work, as far as I know,

on the canon law from an English pen since the days of Lyndewood, to the service of the bishops and clergy of English-speaking countries. It has been written for their practical use; and I venture to hope that it may give an impulse to the deeper study of canon law in English-speaking countries."

The purpose thus expressed, we believe, has been attained in this work with such measure of success as to render it of real value to the clergy and the laity alike.

To write a complete synopsis of the common and particular canon law of the Church in English-speaking countries, and to present the same in smooth and readable English, is a task of rather forbidding proportions. And the author deserves praise for his courage, and thanks for the success he has achieved. The work could scarcely be improved on, within the same limits. The author takes up canonical terms in alphabetical order, as *Abbot, Contumacy, Impediment,* etc. and gives a short resumé of the canon law relating to them. This resumé is sufficiently ample to give a good idea of the law and practice of the Church. The English is good, though somewhat marred by an excess, perhaps, of Latin terms. While we miss the elegance of Blackstone or Kent, still we escape also the awkward clumsiness of style and diction, that is so apt to creep into a work of this kind. It is largely a translation from various sources, mostly Latin works on Canon Law and Moral Theology.

Its value lies in the fact that it brings together, in easily accessible form, a great deal of information about the laws of the Church, which lies scattered thorugh many hundreds of volumes, veiled in an ancient tongue. But as a man in serious legal straits would scarcely rely on *Every man his own lawyer* for the conduct of his case, so we think that Father Taunton's book would hardly suffice, of itself, to extricate a cleric from canonical entanglements. Nor do we judge this to have been the authors' purpose. On the contrary, the work is rather adapted to convey to the clergy of English-speaking countries some systematic knowledge of the laws and canons of the Church, of which knowledge, if it be permitted to entertain a suspicion, some may stand somewhat in need. The book therefore ought to prove of considerable value to its possessors. It is printed and bound in excellent style, and the arragnement of topics renders its contents of easy access.

We have noticed a few slight errors and misprints. On page 193, it is stated that espousals become true marriage, in case of con-

summation before the actual marriage contract. It might have been added that Leo XIII abrogated this effect of espousals. On page 192, Kaskaskia, Prairie du Rocher, etc., are put in the Alton diocese. They are in the diocese of Belleville. The Latin word *Raptus* is rendered into English by *rape*, and it is said that those guilty of rape, like suicides, may not be buried in consecrated ground. Rape has a very definite meaning in modern English, quite different from the Latin "raptus" of the canon law, and those guilty of it may certainly be buried in consecrated ground.

Publica honestas were better rendered, we think, by *public decency* or *propriety*, or some such word, rather than *honesty*. The English equivalent of *Titulus ordinationis* is living.

On page 601, is a misprint "For *says* the sacred canons;" likewise page 484 "We have all sinned, and need the *glory* of God;" likewise on page 493, Portable altars, "that they shall not celebrate out of their own houses * * * * or *with* the consent of the ordinary, if in another diocese." There is an excellent bibliography at the end of the volume. All in all, this is a valuable contribution to English Catholic literature.

JOHN R. MAHONEY.

Studies From Court and Cloister—by J. M. STONE. Sands & Co., London. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.

The literary activity of English Catholics in recent years has certainly been remarkable, considering their small numbers, and no less notable has been the high quality of much of the output. Historical studies have engaged the attention of a large number of their writers, and, naturally, the Reformation period has been, to a large extent, the chief point of interest, naturally, for nowhere more than in regard to this period, must it be the desire of Catholic historical students to obtain a reversal of what they must consider unfair and prejudiced judgments. That such judgments have been wonderfully reversed within the last decade or two everyone must recognize who has been keeping in touch with the published results of the very active historical researches carried on in recent years in England as well by non-Catholic as by Catholic scholars and writers. Amongst those who have helped to bring about this result, Miss Stone, the author of the book now before us, occupies an honorable place. Her *History of Mary the First* though running counter in its avowed aim to one

of the most dearly cherished prejudices of Protestant England, has been hailed by some of the leading English critical reviews as a most valuable contribution to the knowledge of that vexed period of English history.

In the present volume Miss Stone continues her studies along lines already made familiar to her readers, although there is no continuous thread binding into a unity the various essays composing the book, save that the subjects mostly relate to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The volume is an example of book-making very common in these days, the gathering together into a volume of a number of essays originally published in various periodicals. In such cases "padding" frequently becomes a necessity in order to fill out a volume of respectable size, and we fear Miss Stone has had to have recourse to this in the present instance, two of the essays—one on the Runic Crosses of Northumbria and the other on Mallory's *Morte d' Arthur*—seeming to have little in common with the rest of the book which deals with subjects having more or less connection with the change of religion in the sixteenth century, and some of its consequences in the seventeenth. The subjects dealt with are mostly English, though our author makes two excursions to the Continent, one in "The Catholic Reformation in Germany," most of it occupied with the great and remarkably successful labors of Blessed Peter Canisius in stemming the advance of the Protestant Reformation on the Continent; and the other in "Jesuits at Court," her object here being to show that the sons of St. Ignatius, far from desiring or seeking posts of political influence at the courts of princes, labored hard though not always successfully to avoid the same.

Miss Stone in this volume shows no falling off in her ability to write good historical studies, but one or two of the essays might, we think, have been left undisturbed in the pages of the reviews in which they originally appeared. We do not see that much is gained by bestowing labor in tracing out the history of Margaret Tudor, sister of Henry VIII, after her marriage with James IV of Scotland, an unedifying record of falsehood, chicanery and low vulgar intrigue; and, again, to spend pains upon demolishing John Foxe and his *Book of Martyrs* now-a-days seems like slaying the slain. However, as in all Miss Stone's books, the student of history will find much to interest him here, and though he cannot forget he is reading a Catholic author, he will not find critical acumen lost in the partisanship of an advocate. The illustrations, we may add, are really excellent.

SAMUEL P. MACPHERSON.

I. Studies in Idolatry. II. Theosophy and Christianity—by Ernest R. Hull, S. J. Furtado & Bro., Bombay; Catholic Truth Society, London.

We take a special pleasure in introducing these little books to our readers. They have a very real worth in themselves, as we hope to show; but they seem to us to possess even greater value as an example of how the right kind of man can make stepping-stones out of what appear to be stumbling-blocks. Father Hull is a member of the Society of Jesus who was called to work in British India. His time is largely taken up with administrative and editorial duties of an exacting character—he is an official of the archdiocese and the editor of the Bombay *Examiner*—and he lives in an environment not conducive to deep theological speculation; but he has turned attention to the deeper aspects of the native religious life around him, and has produced two works which, though small in extent, make all students of theology his debtors.

His *Studies in Idolatry* is intended as a "preliminary to the direct study of Hinduism itself. The ultimate object is to produce, gradually and as occasion allows, a full system of religious apologetic arranged especially for Hindus." In pursuance of his purpose, Father Hull does not fall into the error (in tactics as well as in fact) of imputing to those whom he wishes to convince beliefs which they repudiate. He begins by defending the Hindus against the charge of idolatry in the sense of what he calls the "stock-and-stone" view. This leads him to a consideration of the Catholic *cultus* of images and the unwarranted charges made against us by Protestants. The whole question— as against the Reformers on the one hand, and the Hindus on the other—is handled with such candor and moderation as will make the most efficient apologetic for every fair-minded opponent.

His papers on *Theosophy and Christianity* will be found of even greater value than his *Studies in Idolatry*. During the past twenty years there has been quite an amount of interest displayed in Theosophy by many in England and America who have been looking about for a substitute for Christianity. It is precisely this brand of Theosophy, refined to suit the Occidental taste, that Father Hull elects to consider. He adopts the plan of setting its philosophical principles, ethical ideals, and practical methods side by side with those of Christianity so that he who reads may choose. According to his own division, the work treats of four main points: ethical ideals and methods; the rival concepts of God; the problem of evil and the solutions offered;

and finally the doctrine of Karma. In discussing these questions he displays the same frankness and moderation as we noticed in the word on Idolatry. The literary style of the papers sometimes betrays the place of their nativity—the columns of a newspaper; but it indicates still more plainly the fairness and good sense of the writer. The latter quality can be shown by a brief quotation. Father Hull has just been granting that external religion has the disadvantage of tending towards formalism. Then he remarks:

"But forms still remain a help. A man who goes to church out of a sense of duty, will out of a sense of fitness try to pray when there; and by the aid of external actions symbolic of prayer, will generally succeed. But a man who, on the plea of worshiping in spirit and truth, stays at home, is much more likely to take up the newspaper than to pray—simply because he lacks an external action to which praying is attached. It is worth noticing that just in those quarters in which religion is most conspicuously on the wane, we hear most of this 'worship in spirit and truth.'"

This is excellent good sense, and most profitable for these times.

We commend this little work to all who wish to find a clear and brief exposition and criticism of the doctrines of Theosophy.

FRANCIS P. DUFFY.

Il Divorzio al lume de la ragione—Monsignor Niccolo Marini. Rome, 1906.

Mgr. Marini is well known throughout Italy by his many able writings on scientific and social subjects. He is always clear, reasonable and judicious. The present work, of 120 pages, is a refutation of the arguments for divorce, based on reasons of State-policy and the interests of the family. It proves clearly and logically that the interests of society and the welfare of the family are, and needs must be, irretrievably injured by the legalization of divorce; that the advantages accruing from divorce or the evils and sufferings following its prohibition by law, are immeasurably outweighed by the vastness of the damage done to the social order as well as to the home, by the enactment of laws granting absolute divorce. In demonstrating this the author relies altogether on arguments drawn from the requirements of the social order and the nature and purpose of marriage. He makes no appeal to Revelation, nor does he draw any argument from religion or the teachings of the Christian faith. He looks solely to the needs of human society and the social order and the nature and purpose of the institution of marriage and of the home, for his argu-

ments. And these he works out in the light of human reason and by the aid of social experience, without reference to Revelation or religion or the ethics of Christianity.

The work is well and skilfully done. To English speaking folk most of the author's arguments have long since been rendered evident by ample and painful experience, which has not been the lot of Italians, (for whom the work is primarilly intended) up to the present time. The author is obliged, therefore, to dwell longer on some of the evil consequences of divorce than would be necessary to convince readers living under a social regime that has long legalized divorce. As a clear, logical and sober statement of the overwhelming evils of divorce as shown by reason and experience, we commend Mgr. Marini's work to our readers.

JOHN R. MAHONEY.

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

The Messenger, July, 1906. JOHN SCULLY, S. J.: "A Recent School History"—(Cheyne's *Short History of England*). JOHN B. SOLA, S. J.: "The California Earthquake, its Nature and Cause." P. G. SMYTH: "The City of the Tribes." CHARLES COUPE, S. J.: "The Electrical Theory of Matter"—(Clear and concise presentation). MICHAEL HOGAN, S. J.: "Was Lord Bacon the 'Father of Modern Science?'"—(Believes that the title is by no means fully merited). M. KENNELLY, S. J.: "Literary Examinations in China." Scripture Department—Criticism of Mgr. Barnes' *The Witness of the Gospels.*

The Dublin Review, July, 1906. WILLIAM BARRY: "Our Latin Bible"—(Traces origin of Latin version, especially the work of St. Jerome). WILFRID WARD: "Some Characteristics of Henry Sidgwick"—(His attitude towards religion). VISCOUNT LLANDAFF: "Matilda of Tuscany." PROF. J. S. PHILLIMORE: "Crinagoras of Mitylene"—(Study, with excellent translations into English verse). "Catholic Social Effort in France"—(Circles, congresses, *le Sillon*, etc). "The Syrian Christians in India." BISHOP CASARTELLI: "The Plaint of the Kine"—(Translation from the Avesta). DOM JOHN CHAPMAN, O. S. B.: "The Condemnation of Pope Honorius" —(First Section of an interesting and important study). "Denominationalism and the Education Bill."

The Irish Theological Quarterly, July, 1906. CARDINAL MORAN: "The Felire of St. Œngus"—(An ancient Irish martyrology). J. MACGUINNESS, C. M.: "M. Loisy and the Gospels"—(A bit of criticism, moderate in tone). T. SLATER, S. J.: "Monopoly Price." CANON O'MAHONY, P. P.: "The Biblical Question"—(A rather general survey of the present state of the question). W. MCDONALD, D. D.: "The Ethical Aspect of Boycotting"—(A carefully reasoned exposition of cases where Boycotting is or is not allowable). JOSEPH MACRORY, D. D.: "The Didascalia and Constitution of the Apostles"—(In connection with Funk's recent edition).

Ecclesiastical Review, July, 1906. Rev. J. V. Tracy, D. D.: "The Catholic Church in the United States"—(A paper written at the request of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, and read at the annual meeting of the Archbishops, held this year, at the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.) Rev. H. G. Hughes: "Devotion to the Sacred Heart." Rev. F. P. Siegfried: "Father Tyrrell's *Lex Credendi*"—(A comprehensive and highly favorable appreciation of Father Tyrrell's latest work). Right Rev. Camillus P. Maes, D. D.: "Father John Francis Rivet, Missionary." Rev. H. J. Heuser: "The Holy Father's Wish Regarding Daily Communion."

The Catholic World, July, 1906. Rev. Patrick J. Healy, D. D.: "A study in Early Christian Apologetics"—(A scholarly review of Professor Dill's recently published work, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*). Louise Imogen Guiney: "Childhood in English Seventeenth Century Poetry." Abbot Gasquet: "Some Letters of Father Hecker"—concluded—(Vivid with the great Paulist's well-known originality of thought and style). Katherine Bregy: "Lionel Johnson: Poet and Critic." A. Lloyd, M. A.: "Japanese Sketches." William F. Dennehy: "Ireland Under Charles II."

The American Journal of Theology, July, 1906. Professor William Adams Brown, D. D.: "Changes in the theology of American Presbyterianism." Profesor Henry Preserved Smith, D. D.: "The Old Testament theory of Atonement." (A scholarly discussion of the various meanings of the Hebrew noun Kepher and its derivatives) Rev. Wilfrid Currier Keirslead, Ph. D.: "Theological presuppositions of Ritschl." Professor James W. Richard, D. D.: "The Church and Divorce" (Mainly an exposition of the attitude maintained towards divorce by the Roman Catholic Church, the Lutheran, the Continental Reformed, and the Church of England. Advocates more religious instruction regarding the nature and responsibilities of the married state). Rev. Henry Adalbert Thompson: "The Catholic Cultus of the Virgin Mary." (An attempt to justify the Protestant attitude toward the Virgin Mary by a very biased appeal to history as embodied almost exclusively in non-Catholic authorities. The hostile prepossessions of the writer effectually hinder him from making proper scientific use of the historical material which he pretends to discuss). "Document:" 'The Scorn of the World:' a poem in Three Books (III.) (Translation from the original Latin of Bernard, a monk of the Benedictine Monastery of Cluny. Translation by Henry Preble under the editorship of S. M. Jackson of New York University). "Recent Theological Literature: Fundamental Reality from the point of view of Psychology," by G. A. Towney. "The Finality of the Christian Religion" by Andrew C. Zenos, etc., etc.

The Princeton Theological Review, July, 1906. Geerhardus Vos: "Christian Faith and the Truthfulness of Bible History." William Brenton Greene, Jr.: "Broad Churchism and the Christian Life." D. Beatton: "The Marrow of Modern Divinity and the Marrow Controversy." James Lindsay "The Development of Scottish Theology." Frederick W. Loetscher: "Schwenckfeld's Participation in the Eucharistic Controversy of the Sixteenth Century."

The Hibbert Journal, July, 1906. Sir Oliver Lodge: "First Principles of Faith." Canon Knox Little: "Denominationalism, Undenominationalism, and the Church of England." H. A. Garnett: "A Layman's plea For the Separation of the Creeds from Worship." The Headmaster of Bradfield College: "The Teaching of the Christian Religion in Public Schools." Prof. Henry Jones: "The Working Faith of the Social Reformer, (IV)." D. H. McGregor: "The Great Fallacy of Idealism." Prof. Robert H. Smith: "Japanese Character and its Probable Influence Outside Japan." Rev. P. T. Forsyth D. D.; "A Rallying-

ground for the Free Churches." REV. K. C. ANDERSON, D. D.: "Why Not Face the Facts? An Appeal to Protestants." MISS C. E. STEPHEN: "Signs and Wonders in Divine Guidance." MISS EDITH GITTINS: "The Suffering of the Saints." REV. BENJAMIN W. BACON, D. D.: "Gospel Types in Primitive Tradition."

Revue Biblique Internationale, July, 1906. "Communications de la Commission Pontificale pour les études bibliques." M. LOUIS DE LA VALLEE POUSSIN: "Le bouddhisme et les évangiles canoniques."—(An interesting study a propos of a recent book entitled Buddhist and Christian Gospels, by Albert J. Edmunds. The writer dissents strongly from the conclusions arrived at in the book and denies the reality of Buddhistic infiltrations). R. P. LAGRANGE: "L'avènement du Fils de l'Homme" (I).—(A masterly discussion of the very difficult problem connected with the New Testament idea of the Parousia. In the present section the learned writer confines himself to a study of the eschatological discourse of the Saviour as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels). M. CLERMONT-GANNEAU: "L'édit byzantin de Bersabée." IGNAZIO GUIDI: "Une description arabe du Sinai."

Revue du Clergé Français, June 1st, 1906. J. AIRAUDI: "La presse catholique et le clergé." J. TURMEL: "Chronique d'histoire." J. CAUDRON: "Le fond de la mystique." J. TURMEL: "Chronique d'histoire ecclésiastique." F. MARTIN: "Chronique artistique." . . . H. LEDUC: "Le développement du dogme chrétien." "La liberté de l'Eglise catholique aux Etats-Unis." "L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ." F. DUBOIS: "L'essence du sacrifice de la messe." P. DEPREUX: "A propos de la séparation. Ouvrages récents." June 15th, 1906. E. CAULIE: "Le devoir de la prédication." C. LECIGNE: "Le capitaine Wyart." H. PRADEL: "Une élection épiscopale sous les Mérovingiens, d'après Grégoire de Tours." J. TURMEL: "L'Enchiridion de Denzinger." P. DESPREUX: "A propos de la Séparation." H. LEDUC: "Prédication, direction et instruction religieuse, etc." J. M. SIMON: "Les Ordres religieux au Sénat de Bavière," July 15th, 1906. J. TURMEL: "La théologie de Bossuet et la théologie contemporaine." F. A. LIGNEUL: "Les religions japonaises et leur état actuel." CH. URBAIN: "Histoire et érudition." L. WINTREBERT: "Chronique scientifique." A. BOUDINHON: "Sur la taxe bénéficiale pour les séminaires." "Sur les empechêments de mariage." P. DESPREUX: "Autour de la Séparation. Publications récentes." G. SORTAIS: "Fra Angelico, Michel-Ange et Raphael."

Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique, June, 1906. MGR. PIERRE BATIFFOL: "Evolutionisme et histoire, réponse a un article récent." A. DURAND: "Un livre nouveau sur l' inspiration de l'Ecriture." M. HENRI BREMOND: "Littérature newmanienne.—L'expérience religieuse, d'apres M. William James."

Revue Pratique d' Apologétique, June 15th, 1906. M. LEPIN: "Evangiles canoniques et Evangiles apocryphes." J. RIVIERE: "La Propagation du Christianisme dans les trois premiers siècles (Suite)." A. DE LAPPARENT: "La Recherche scientifique de la Foi." J. CARTIER: "Le Livre d'Hénoch." A. FANTON: "Les silex du tertiaire sont-ils des documents anthropologiques?" E. GRISELLE: "Une lettre inédite de Nicole sur un argument de Bossuet." July 1st, 1906. J. RIVIERE: "La Propagation du Christianisme dans les trois premiers siècles." G. BERTRIN: "Lourdes et le Miracle Contemporain." L. FILLION: "Un récent ouvrage sur le Quatrième Évangile." July 15th, 1906. E. VACANDARD: "La Question du service militaire chez les chrétiens des premiers siècles." A. BAUDRILLART: "A propos de l'Inquisition; Mariages royaux, attentats anarchistes et autodafés." V. ERMONI: "Un texte christologique de saint Paul interpreté par saint Jean Chrysostome." H.

LESETRE: "Les récits de l'histoire sainte: La Tour de Babel." "Authenticité mosaique du Pentateuque."

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse, May-June, 1906. JACQUES ZEILLER: "Saint Domnius de Salone." ANTOINE DUPIN: "Les origines des controverses trinitaires." L. SAINT-PAUL: "L'inscription *Puer Magus*."

Revue Augustinienne, July 15th, 1906. FRANCOIS DE PAULE BLACHERE: "La probabilité morale et le Saint-Office." HIPPOLYTE GIRY: "Le droit canonique de demain." ADOLPHE DOSSAT: "L'obéissance canonique des clercs." AURELIUS UNTERLEIDNER: "La foi d'adhésion sentimentale." LIEVIN BUARAIN: "Notes de théologie russe: un type de théologien; une prétendue note de l'Eglise orthodoxe; a propos de l'Epiclèse."

L'Université Catholique, June 15th, 1906. Abbé DELFOUR: "L'Ecole d'aujourd'hui." G. ANDRE: "Une page d'histoire sur les Associations Cultuelles." DU MAGNY: "Le nouveau statut légal de l'église de France." RIVET: "La loi de Séparation." July 15th, 1906. A. DEVAUX: "Les noms de lieux d'origine religieuse, dans la région Lyonnaise." A. BOUCHERLAT: "A propos d'honoraires de messes." O. C. REURE: "Les deux passages de Pie VII a Lyon et la rétablissement du culte a Fourviere." ABBE DELFOUR: "Un protecteur de l'Eglise." M. LEPIN: "La venue de saint Jean a Ephèse." E. PODECHARD: "Revue d'Ecriture sainte: Ancien Testament." E. JACQUIER: "Revue d'Ecriture sainte: Nouveau Testament."

Studi Religiosi, May-June, 1906. P. A. PALMIERI: "La mente e l'opera di Ermanno Schell." (A comprehensive, discriminating and, on the whole, a very favorable appreciation of the late lamented professor and his work). E. BREMOND: "La Filosofia religiosa di Newman." (Among other topics discusses Newman's views on the supremacy of conscience and the Communion of Saints). M. FREDERICI: "Il Commercio e l'industria degli antichi Ebrei." (An interesting and sholarly study in Biblical Archæology). L. FRANCESCHI: "Theologia morale e Scienza medica." MINOCCHI, S.: "Versione di Isaia, Cap. xxxviii, 10—xliii, 21.

Bessarione, March-April, 1906. P. AURELIO PALMIERI: "I nomi di Dio nella Teologia Coranica." P. LUDOVICO GIGANOTTO: "Dell preghiera. Saggio di ascetica Origeniana ricavato dal libro 'De Oratione.'" P. G. BALESTRI: "Il Martirio di S. Teodoro l'Orientale e de' suoi compagni Leonzio l'Arabo e Panigiris il Persiano (Testo copto e traduzione)." G. COZZA-LUZI: "I grandi lavori del Cardinal Angelo Mai." BENIGNO FERRARIO: "Studi egiziani." P. Aurelio PALMIERRI: "La poesia delle tombe presso i greci moderni."

Revista Storico-Critica della Scienze Teologiche, June, 1906. P. BALDINI: "Scoto Erigena e la filosofia religiosa nel IX secolo." N. TURCHI: "I caratteri della civilta bizantina." P. A. PALMIERI, O. S. A.: "La setta dei Mariaviti in Polonia." S. GROSSI: "Evagrio e un preteso nuovo documento su lo scisma acaciano." E. BUONAIUTI: "Bolletino di Storia Ecclesiastico: Evo medio e moderno." July-August, 1906. G. BONACCORSI: "I vangeli." V. ERMONI: "La fede nel Nuovo Testamento." U. FRACASSINI: "L'azione dello Spirito Santo nel Cristianesimo primitivo." G. GARAVANI: "La questione storica dei Fioretti di s. Francesco e il loro posto nella Storia dell' Ordine." G. MICHELINI: "Presbitere" nell antica Chiesa."

La Scuola Cattolica, July, 1906. SAC. GIUSEPPE BALLERINI: "Il Concepimento verginale di Gesu e la critica moderna." PROF. MARCO BELLI: "Magia e Pregiudizi in Tito Lucrezio Caro." GUIDO MATTIUSSI, S. J.: "Primato della Volonta." FRA. DOTT. AGOSTINO GEMELLI: "Conflitto di tendenze."

WITH OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

In the "Who's Who" of 1905 we find the following biographical details concerning the gifted and versatile writer whose article heads the present issue. Rev. William Francis Barry, D. D., was born in London, April 21st, 1849. He received his classical education at Oscott College near Birmingham, after which he pursued his theological studies in Rome, where he was a student of the English College, and received his doctor's degree at the Gregorian University. In this famous institution he had for professors Cardinals Franzelin and Tarquini and the renowned Perrone. He was in Rome during the Vatican Council and the taking of the city by the Piedmontese in 1870. Returning to England he was from 1873 to 1877 Vice-President and Professor of Philosophy at Birmingham Theological College; from 1877 to 1880 he occupied the Chair of Divinity at Oscott. He was appointed to Dorchester in 1883, having been a year on mission in Wolverhampton. In 1893 Dr. Barry delivered addresses in America, and lectured at the Royal Institution; also in many parts of England. Among his many and various publications may be mentioned the following: "The New Antigone," 1887; "The Two Standards," 1898; "Arden Massiter," 1900; "The Wizard's Knot," 1901; "The Dayspring," 1903—works of fiction; "The Papal Monarchy," 1902; "Newman," 1904, etc. besider more than seventy essays in periodicals, and a number of "Recreations," viz., excursions into Oriental literatures, chiefly Hebrew and Persian. His latest work "The Tradition of Scripture" was reviewed in the last issue of the New York Review.